

PHYSICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

SOUTHWESTERN POLITICAL AND SCIENCE QUARTERLY

VOL. V DECEMBER, 1922

Editor in Charge
H. G. JAMES, University of Texas

Members of Editorial Board
F. F. BLACHELY, University of Oklahoma
W. B. BODENHAFFER, Washington University
H. B. CHUBB, University of Kansas
C. F. COAN, University of New Mexico
M. S. HANDMAN, University of Texas
D. Y. THOMAS, University of Arkansas
G. P. WYCKOFF, Tulane University of Louisiana

CONTENTS

NEED AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICANIZATION IN THE SOUTHWEST	J. E. Pugh
THE MOVEMENT FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF STATE ADMINISTRATION IN TEXAS	Frank M. Smith
CALLING THE SECESSION CONVENTION IN 1861	David Y. Thomas
SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN TEXAS	Ernest R. Rindge
THE ECONOMICS AND POLITICS OF THE AGRICULTURAL TARIFF	Lawrence J. Burpee
NEWS AND NOTES	Frank M. Smith
BOOK REVIEWS	G. P. Wyckoff

PUBLISHED BY
THE SOUTHWESTERN POLITICAL AND
SCIENCE QUARTERLY

"Entered as second-class mail matter, October 1, 1911, at the post office at
Austin, Texas, under No. 100,000."

The Southwestern Political and Social Science Association

PRESIDENT

W. M. W. SPLAWN, Austin, Texas

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

GEORGE B. DEALLEY, Dallas, Texas

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

F. F. BLACHLY, Norman, Oklahoma

THIRD VICE-PRESIDENT

D. Y. THOMAS, Fayetteville, Arkansas

SECRETARY AND TREASURER

F. M. STEWART, Austin, Texas

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT W. M. W. SPLAWN, Austin, Texas

EX-PRESIDENT A. P. WOOLDRIDGE, Austin, Texas

EX-PRESIDENT GEORGE VAUGHAN, Little Rock, Arkansas

EX-PRESIDENT C. B. AMES, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

VICE-PRESIDENT GEORGE B. DEALLEY, Dallas, Texas

VICE-PRESIDENT F. F. BLACHLY, Norman, Oklahoma

VICE-PRESIDENT D. Y. THOMAS, Fayetteville, Arkansas

EDITOR OF QUARTERLY, H. G. JAMES, Austin, Texas

SECRETARY AND TREASURER F. M. STEWART, Austin, Texas

ELECTED MEMBERS { **E. T. MILLER, Austin, Texas**
 { **T. S. STAPLES, Conway, Arkansas**

THE SOUTHWESTERN POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY is supplied to all members of the Southwestern Political and Social Science Association. The subscription price of the QUARTERLY is two dollars a year. Applications for membership, orders for the QUARTERLY and remittances should be addressed to F. M. Stewart, Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, University Station, Austin, Texas.

Correspondence with reference to contributions to the QUARTERLY should be addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas. Station, Austin, Texas.

THE SOUTHWESTERN POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

Vol. V

DECEMBER, 1924

No. 3

*The editors disclaim responsibility for views expressed by contributors
to THE QUARTERLY*

NEED AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN THE SOUTHWEST

J. E. PEARCE

University of Texas

In anthropological literature and discussions, the expression "the Southwest" does not apply to the same district as that indicated when the term is used in commercial and popular discussions. We shall have first, therefore, to determine just what is meant by "the Southwest" in the above caption, and in doing this, we shall have to go briefly into the history of the special use of the term in anthropology.

The writer has, on his desk, a new book by Dr. A. V. Kidder, of Phillips Academy, entitled "Southwestern Archeology." In a long list of authorities cited in the bibliography referring to approximately three hundred publications, not one is found that has anything to do, even remotely, with Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, or Louisiana. In commercial circles, certainly in the states mentioned, these states constitute "the Southwest." Kidder, and with him practically all writers on American archeology or ethnology, has confined the term to those states lying westward from Texas to the Pacific. The states of the commercial Southwest are referred to by name, or, as in the case of Arkansas and Louisiana, as portions of the lower Mississippi Valley. In this paper, then, the Southwest is not Kidder's Southwest, but the commercial Southwest; viz., Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

The explanation of this distinction in the significance of the geographical term is not altogether creditable to us of the commercial Southwest, and indicates graphically the need for anthropological research in this field. There has been intensive long continued archeological research in the region between Texas and the Pacific, and this research has resulted in a voluminous literature dealing primarily with the Pueblo culture. Throughout this literature, which is widely read and much quoted, the term Southwest is made to cover New Mexico, Arizona, and the southern portions of Colorado and Utah. In Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas, there has been relatively little anthropological research made. So this region, particularly Texas, is yet to be put upon the archeological and ethnological maps. To indicate what has been done, and what remains to be done, in this field, is the purpose of this paper.

This region divides naturally into several distinct geographical areas, which correspond rather strikingly to the primitive culture areas. In the east, extending from the Mississippi River to the ninety-sixth parallel of latitude, is one distinctive area, and in this we find, everywhere, traces of a relatively settled horticultural village society. The rolling prairies and open plains constitute a second area, extending from the west edge of the first to the Pecos and the Rockies. Everywhere, throughout this second region, are found only evidences of a nomad hunter culture. Nowhere here, do we find pottery, or polished stone implements, except as evidences of intrusion from the forested area, or from the Pueblo region. Where they are found, it is in meager quantity. In the Trans-Pecos portion of Texas, we have the eastern edge of the Pueblo culture overlapping the plains culture, and the resulting complex modified with special adaptations to the mountain environment. The rock paintings, traces of irrigation ditches and dikes, and relics found in rock shelters and caves confirm this supposition. In the low coastal plain of Texas and Louisiana, we have a fourth distinctive area, in which have been found, so far, chiefly evidence of a relatively low, if not degraded, form of culture, based largely upon fishing, the

gathering of shell fish, and the hunting of small animals. The writer is less familiar with this region, and with the Trans-Pecos, than with the two first named.

Let us take up each of these areas in turn, and mention, first, what research has been done, then indicate what remains to be done, and, finally, discuss briefly the reasons why the world has a right to expect that this research be done.

In Louisiana and Arkansas, Clarence B. Moore made extensive archeological explorations while investigating generally in the lower Mississippi Valley. He nosed about in the navigable streams and bayous of this region, using the crew of his yacht, or of a chartered steamer, for the work of opening mounds and burial places. He explored many of the funeral mounds, which characterize the region, and recovered from them, and from other burial places, many interesting and illuminating artifacts; such as cutting and piercing tools and weapons, sewing and netting needles of bone and horn, mesh spacers, or sizers, for weaving nets, and banner stones. He also found hundreds, possibly thousands of objects in burnt clay; such as pots, bottles, pipes, cone supports for pots, etc. Many amulets, gorgets, beads of bone, shell, or copper, plummets and problematical objects were also obtained in his explorations.

He had been preceded by various representatives of the Bureau of American Ethnology. The accounts of these investigations may be found in the Twelfth Annual Report of this bureau, which is devoted entirely to the Mound Builder Culture. Many other investigators have studied partial sections of this field; as, for example, the highly creditable work in Southwest Arkansas, of M. R. Harrington, of the Heye Museum of the American Indian. The result of all this work, is that the Mound Builder culture has been fairly well reconstructed, the different subordinate culture areas delimited, and the whole culture related, in a general way, to that of the historical Indians.

There remain many local problems to solve; even in Louisiana and Arkansas, where so much has been done, only a fraction of the known camp sites and mounds have been

explored. As the pottery of this region was the finest, in the development of incised decoration, and in certain other aspects, within the bounds of the present United States, specimens of it are much sought after for museum and educational purposes. Archeologists will continue, therefore, to find this a rich field for many years to come.

In southwestern Louisiana, and in the whole of the Texas Mound Builder field, very little has been done. In this region, the mounds are not so large and striking as in northern and eastern Louisiana, and Arkansas, but they are sufficiently large and numerous to prove, beyond doubt, that the Mound Builder culture, particularly the complex of mound building, prevailed here.

The writer spent one summer surveying the East Texas region, and visited mounds near Alto, Nacogdoches, and along the Sabine and Red rivers. He explored in detail one burial place near Frankston, where numerous specimens of pottery were obtained; also an ancient village site on the Sabine in south Harrison county. The work of serious exploration, however, has hardly been begun. What has been done, tends to indicate that this region constitutes a distinctive culture area of the generalized Mound Builder culture. No pottery has been found in this section that compares, in beauty of outline, or in the symmetry and beauty of engraved decoration, with many specimens obtained by Moore along the Mississippi in eastern Louisiana and Arkansas, and by Harrington in southwest Arkansas.

Everywhere, in this region, however, the writer found evidences of a relatively settled village life, implying a large dependence on horticulture for food supply. Near Frankston, at one old village site, he found immense quantities of shard. Tons of it could be gathered at this place, and everywhere throughout the forested areas of Texas it abounds, more or less. It varies in form, materials employed for tempering, method and style of decoration, etc., as one goes from county to county, but everywhere it is conspicuously present, particularly in the northern parts. As one comes toward the coast, it thins out, and is found in meager quantities, or in mean form, from Huntsville south.

There are many and interesting problems yet to be solved here, in tracing the origin and development of decorative designs, in studying forms of vessels, and methods of building and shaping the pots; also in separating the primitive from the recent. More important still is the problem of relating the culture of the settled village life of the forests to that of the praries and plains.

In taking up the second area, it should be said, to begin with, that the remains found here are in striking contrast to those found in the first. This region is vast, extending from the forest to the Rockies, and was a large part of the habitat of the buffalo. In historical times, the Indians lived largely off of this animal, following it, to a large extent, in its periodical migrations from the coasts of Texas to the Rockies, and back. This fact, together with other factors of the environment, tended to force on the Indian, in this region, a rather extreme form of nomad hunter culture.

The kitchen middens of central and west Texas, found so numerously and in such voluminous size, and known generally as the "burnt rock" mounds, furnish abundant and illuminating evidence of the general character of Indian life on the plains—evidence which extends, of course, indefinitely backwards through the ages. These mounds are so unique and so important in their implications that we shall speak of them somewhat in detail.

They extend from the Balcones fault line westward into New Mexico. This fault line divides the black prairies from the cretaceous limestone outcroppings, and runs from near Dallas through Austin and San Antonio, and, hence, westward through Uvalde to the Rio Grande, near Del Rio.

From north to south, the burnt rock mound area extends, in one form or another, from the Panhandle and Oklahoma into old Mexico. A few mounds are found in southern Oklahoma, and, in scattered form, they exist over the Plains. They are concentrated in the cretaceous regions west of Austin.

In the eastern portion of the mound area, they are generally circular or elliptical in marginal outline, rounded or spherical in contour, and rise from a few inches to five

feet above the surfact of the land on which they are located. They are situated near water, often in groups of from two to eight or ten, and usually are ranged in a line paralleling the bank of a nearby stream. The chief constituent element of these mounds is limestone in the form of sharp-edged chunks about the size of half bricks, all of which show evidences of having been highly heated. Intermingled with the broken limestone, are found large quantities of kitchen refuse; such as charcoal, usually in a finely divided state, broken and splintered bones, mussel shells, snail shells, etc.; also slivers and flakes from the manufacture of flint weapons and tools, together with many artifacts of stone. These artifacts exhibit all stages of manufacture, and often indicate prolonged use. Frequently, many perfect specimens of stone artifacts are found in the mounds.

In the west, the mounds are usually circular or ring-like in shape, with a depression in the middle going down to the native soil. In this region, they are, furthermore, situated a hundred yards or more back from the springs, or water holes.

The great numbers of these mounds, their large size, and the character fo their contents make them unique, and give them large importance among the archaeological remains of prehistoric man. Their highly porous nature, and their position above the general soil level, cause them to drain out quickly after rain and make them an ideal protection for the artifacts and bone and shell fragments which they contain.

The writer has now explored some twenty-five of them altogether, moving all the contents of some, most of the contents of others, and running trenches through still others. Everywhere, they give evidence of a nomad hunting life, with uneven sporadic evidence of horticulture intermingled here and there. Nowhere, in these mounds, has the writer found a single piece of potshard, or a single piece of polished stone. He recovered more than two thousand stone artifacts from one mound at Round Rock, but no one of them showed traces of the art of polishing. Evidences of skin dressing and skin working tools, such as scrapers,

needles, and knives, are found numerous, and in many forms. Manos and metates are found, sometimes in considerable numbers, over the surface of the mounds and over the general surface of adjacent regions, especially where the mounds are situated in rich valleys. These imply corn culture, in spots, and in recent times, but in some, even on large mounds, no traces of corn grinding stones are found. The evidences of fire throughout the mounds, and the constant presence of kitchen refuse, force the conclusion that most of them, at least, are pure kitchen middens.

The question of their age is one of extreme interest and importance. One on Dry Creek, near Austin, has a total contents of about fifteen hundred cubic yards, three-quarters of the material being the broken limestone. This limestone comes from slabs used to hold fires together, and for cooking. On getting wet, after being repeatedly heated, these slabs crumbled into such fragments as are found in the mounds. There was never more than one fire on a mound at a time, and there are good reasons for believing that the accumulation could not have gone forward faster than at the rate of one yard per year. This would mean that the Dry Creek Mound was fifteen hundred years in reaching its present size. There are other evidences that these mounds are many centuries old. Throughout their content, and everywhere, they give evidence of a life highly adjusted to the environment, and in marked contrast to the life of the forested areas. We get here, in comparison with the first district, a pronounced suggestion of that early differentiation of society into the primitive forms so characteristic of Europe and Asia; viz. the nomad hunter-herder type, on the one hand, and the sedentary horticultural villiage type, on the other. The peoples of these two culture types have always hated one another, and their perpetual strife has deluged the Old World with blood, and brought about many conquests that have radically modified the course of history. In China, they were finally separated by the Great Wall, the largest structure that man has ever erected on our earth. In Texas, this same hatred was in evidence among the historical Indians.

The writer, working in coöperation with the Smithsonian Institution, has spent the greater part of three summers investigating these mounds. He hopes shortly to publish the results of his researches to date, but he has hardly scratched the surface in the work of exploring the field as a whole.

There remain many problems to solve in connection with the mounds, and few have been solved finally. The age of the mounds, changes in the culture illustrated in them, special meaning for some of them, culture districts, and their relations to the historical Indians, are questions to be solved, in whole or in part.

In the second district, are found also many other relics that throw light on man's culture history. A few of these will be mentioned briefly.

Texas possesses large quantities of high grade flint; in fact, more and better flint probably than any other portion of the United States. Flint was to men living in the Stone Age what iron and other metals are to men of the Iron Age. It is found in flat nodules, all through the cretaceous beds of Texas, and, in places, strata outcrop in the beds of streams, in canyons, and on hillsides, which are fully half flint. Where the limestone of these strata is soft, so as to make the work of extracting flint easy, the outcrop was visited frequently by the Indians, and became a flint mine. The mounds near these mines took on the nature of work shops. Quarried flint, fresh from the earth, is usually much more easily worked than flint found along the beds of streams, or on the surface of the land. The effects of weathering, particularly of long summer drought, and of the consequent thorough drying out, are to render the stone brittle, and to make fine chipping difficult.

One such mine is found on the top of a ridge, or mesa, near the line of Comanche and Brown counties. It covers many acres, and is almost certainly the largest flint mine in the United States, possibly the largest in the world. Mounds on the slopes below, and along the nearby streams, are numerous, and will certainly repay richly an adequate investigation. The writer visited the place on a survey excursion, but has done no real research work at this place.

Outcrops of flint are found all along the Balcones fault line, just to the west, and flint mines were located at Round Rock, just above the dam on Lake Austin, and elsewhere along this line.

In fact, the Balcones fault line figured largely in the old Indian life of the State. Up out of it come the heads of the San Marcos River, the Comal River, and numerous big springs; such as the San Pedro Spring at San Antonio, and Barton, Cold, and Mormon springs at Austin. Along this line the Indians found everything that primitive hunters desire; viz., fine flint in abundance; plenty of excellent wood in the mountain cedar, much of it dead, dry, and easily obtained; and excellent cover for game. This meant the prevalence, in this region, of large numbers of deer and antelopes, to say nothing of turkeys, rabbits, squirrels, and other small animals and birds. Here were found, too, clear beautiful springs and streams, providing abundance of fish, crustaceans, and shell fish; and, finally, abundance of limestone slabs, for holding fires together, and on which to cook. That the Indians understood and appreciated these, is amply attested by the numerous and extensive kitchen middens at Georgetown, Round Rock, Barton Creek, San Marcos, New Braunfels and San Antonio. The writer has done some exploring at all of these places, but no exhaustive research has been done at any of them.

In the middle western portion of this region, from Brown County to the west and south, are the ring mounds. The writer has explored these in only a few places in Brown and San Saba counties, where he found them to be genuine kitchen middens. Their form is due to the practice of throwing back the broken limestone as it accumulated, so as to keep the fire always on the ground. Farther east, the rock was allowed to accumulate in a spherical mound, the fireplace being the middle and top of the mound. The writer essays to explain this difference in his accounts of the burnt rock mounds, yet to be published, but more work should be done upon the ring mounds, and they should be explored throughout the west.

There are extensive caves and rock shelters throughout

the limestone regions, many of which were occupied at times, by man. Almost none of these has been seriously explored. Many caves were used as burial places, and a few skeletons have been obtained from caves along Devil's River. Professor Victor J. Smith of the State Normal College at Alpine has investigated some of these, together with other archeological sites in the Trans-Pecos region.

Numerous Indian rock paintings and inscriptions are found along the rock bluffs and canyon walls at various places in the region of the ring mounds. Paint Rock, on the Concho, gets its name from such paintings. Others are found on the South Llano, still others at various places on Devil's River. Along the lower Pecos and the Rio Grande of the Great Bend region, these paintings, together with petroglyphs, occur, sometimes in large numbers. None of these has yet been copied for publication, or described in printed accounts. They are being destroyed by vandals, and should be reproduced, in permanent record form, as soon as possible. Some of them are certainly pictographic, and such specimens and records in the early history of writing are too rare and too valuable to be allowed to perish.

Beyond the Pecos, in the third district, is one living Pueblo village, at Ysleta, on the Rio Grande, and Dr. Udden of the Department of Economic Geology, University of Texas, and others, report traces in the Big Bend country of what seems to have been leveled fields with ditches, once used in irrigation. Judge Batts of Austin, and other Texans, while hunting, have found extensive ruins, of cliff dwelling nature, in the mountains of northern Mexico. The large transition fields, to the south and east of the Pueblo cliff dwelling culture area, between that and the Plains Indian area, lie in north Mexico, Trans-Pecos Texas, the Panhandle and western Oklahoma, and have nowhere been adequately studied. True, Morehead of Andover, and others have explored some portions of the upper courses of the Canadian and Arkansas rivers, and have found interesting ruins there, suggestive of Pueblo origins, but their work, far from being complete, has only been sufficient to arouse a keen interest and to indicate the possibility of establishing

positively a relationship between the Pueblo and Mound Builder cultures

Finally, the fourth region, the low coastal plain of the Gulf, has hardly been investigated at all. Mr. A. E. Anderson of Brownsville, and others have creditable collections of artifacts, gathered in this region but no professional archeologist has made serious systematic investigations. Kitchen middens, composed mostly of shells, are numerous and extensive, as would be expected. Moreover, if a migration movement from the Mississippi Valley to Mexico, or the reverse, ever occurred, this is the part through which it would almost surely have passed. Here and there, over the central and eastern portions of Texas, artifacts have been found that point to such migration, but they are not of sufficient number, as yet, to establish a final conclusion. Among such finds may be mentioned that of twenty-six large ceremonial axe blades, which had been buried in a cache near the Colorado River bank in South Austin, and which are very comparable to many from east Tennessee, but utterly unlike the great bulk of those that have been found in Texas; also a beautiful jasper banner stone, found at New Braunfels, and which is almost exactly like two in the possession of Professor Pritchett of Huntsville, one of which came from the Red River Valley in Texas, and one from a mound in southern Missouri. Stones shaped like these were highly characteristic of the Mound Builder culture.

The importance of doing archaeological research, at all, and specifically of working out the archaeological problems of the Southwest, may well be briefly discussed at this point.

When we consider that man spent somewhere between 500,000 and 1,000,000 years in those stages of culture, together known as the Stone Age, that he began working metals—certainly iron—nowhere on earth earlier than 5,000 years ago, that is to say, that the length of the period of savagery is to that of civilization as 100 to 1, we must realize that the fundamental human qualities were necessarily worked out and relatively fixed in this long

drawn out early period. This, scientists now generally agree to be a fact, and it accounts for man's having so nearly the same general characteristics the world over. For example, in physical characters, he has everywhere over the earth nearly the same stature, the same hairless body, the same relatively large brain, the same upright attitude with biped plantigrade procedure, and all groups of men are fertile *inter se*. These facts have caused a majority of naturalists, until recently, at any rate, to class all extant forms of man in a single species. Not only so, but man's fundamental social practices are more nearly the same everywhere than would appear to be the case at first sight. Everywhere he uses vocal speech, everywhere he makes and utilizes fire, and all men use tools and weapons, which they shape from sticks and stones by artificial processes. None of these facts are found in the animal world below man. All men have, in common with some birds and insects, a sense of music; all use, in common again with birds and insects, mud and vegetable fiber for making containers or protective devices against weather. All have a sense of ornament. All men, below the surface, are essentially savages, and the most civilized slip back into savage mental attitudes and practices upon the slightest provocation. We are still savage hunters, says Dewey when we go courting, in seeking our fortunes among our fellows, in diplomacy, and in war. The general mental pattern was worked out almost finally during the prolonged period of savagery with its hunting, ceaseless war, and relatively fixed social and economic practices.

But races of men differ in the relative emphasis they put upon, or the uses they make of, their common natural powers, and their common social practices. Some are thrifty, foresighted, industrious, and energetic, in a much larger degree than others, and so build up a monogamic family life, systems of education, effective armies and navies, efficient governments, and particularly a comfort producing economy. These come, in time, to be what we call the progressive peoples. Others, usually tropical peoples, have a minimum tendency to prevision and

provision, refuse to take thought of the morrow, acquire little property, and build weak and unstable political institutions.

Now, the record of relative emphasis within the human values is the record of progress or non-progress; it is, also, a record, incidentally, of the influence of environment, or geography, in history. The quintessence of human wisdom lies in foreseeing difficulties, and in preparing against their coming.

Ability to foresee the future is in exact proportion to an understanding knowledge of the past, and much, perhaps most, of the fundamental knowledge of man's past is to be had by intensive scientific study of the things man leaves behind him. That is to say, the fortuitous record which man leaves, incident to his manner of living, is comparable, in human history, to the geological record of organic evolution.

Texas, in particular, and in the Southwest in general, constitutes a critical field of archaeological study, because of (1) the location of this field, across the transition fields of the old culture areas of the Mound Builders, the Pueblos, and the ancient Mexicans, and (2) because of the light to be had, through archaeological research, on the problem of the origin of the fundamental types of society; viz., hunter-herding-marauding-military type, and the sedentary-village-agricultural-industrial type.

Finally, in this connection, this research should be done thoroughly, and as early as possible, for the sake of the numerous specimens of Stone Age arts which will be obtained, and which will thus pass into competent and appreciative hands, to find their way ultimately into permanent museum collections. At present, many of them are being destroyed by ignorant and unappreciative persons, into whose hands they happen to fall. Many are being kept in private homes, where they are constantly exposed to danger of destruction at the hands of children and servants, or by fire. When accumulated in quantity, they can be used in exchange for specimens from distant parts, and thus be the means of buliding up cosmopolitan anthropological collections.

This last motive is a large one, and would, alone, justify the whole research enterprise here outlined. One has only to know a little of the rapidity with which the museum movement is growing, in order to realize that the presence and the proper care and development of museums constitute one of the surest marks of enlightenment and progress.

The ethnological problems of the Southwest are not very extensive, so far as they pertain to the old Indian stock. However, there are some ethnological problems left yet to be worked out, even among the scanty remains of our Indian population, and some very large and pressing ones in the form of current race relations of whites, Mexicans, and negroes

In Texas, there are only two small groups of Indians left; the Alabama group of Polk County, and various small groups on the Rio Grande. The Polk County group are in a woeful state of neglect, and are fast disappearing; those on the Rio Grande are amalgamating with Mexicans and whites. Both groups should be studied and looked after by special legislation.

The ancient Indian tribes of Texas have received a scantier consideration at the hands of the whites than any portion of the early Indian population within the boundaries of the present United States. The result is, that we know less about them than is known about any other portion of the former Indian peoples of this country.

This fact is due to the peculiar history of Texas, and, especially, to the intractable character of the Comanches and Apaches. The Attacapan, the Karankawan, and Tonkawan peoples had the usual Indian history, and melted away in the presence of the whites from war, disease, and starvation, until they have become extinct, or virtually so. The Comanches and Apaches fought continuously and fiercely with all whites, and fought the later Texans so ferociously that they were but little exposed to white diseases, and other disintegrating and destructive effects of having to live in the white man's immediate presence. But this meant a truceless warfare, which engendered a relentless hatred of these Indians by white Texans, and this

hatred was directed later toward all Indians. When Texas came into the Union, she retained control of her public lands, but the white lack of interest in, or sympathy for, the Indians resulted in no permanent reservations being set aside for them, and they were, in the end, ruthlessly driven from the State. The Federal Government gathered the broken remnants of the Texas tribes into the present State of Oklahoma. This Government, however, owning no public lands in Texas, and resenting, certainly at times, the arbitrary way in which the Texans sought to unload on it the burden of caring for their Indian wards, has taken but little interest in the history of Texas Indians, or even in Texas archaeology. The voluminous annual reports and bulletins of the Bureau of American Ethnology contain but little on either Texas Indian ethnology, or Texas archaeology.

The remnants of Apache and Comanche tribes should be carefully studied for the sake of gleaning any little traces of their past institutional life that may still linger among them. The small remnant of the Tonkawa still left should be investigated promptly, as this tribe is on the verge of extinction. Probably only one or two old men or women remain, if, indeed, any are yet left who remember anything of their language; and this language, so nearly extinct, has never been studied or its vocabulary recorded.

All ethnological facts that remain intact among the scattered and broken tribes of Oklahoma, and which have not already been described in print, should be gleaned, and accounts published of them, as early as possible. The old life of these tribes is rapidly disintegrating, and there will soon be nothing of it to study. Professor Bolton of the University of California, and, in a smaller way, Professor Barker, and others of the Department of History of the University of Texas, have recovered a good deal of the ethnology of the old Texas tribes, from the public records and mission manuscripts of Old Mexico. In the introduction to his two-volume work on *Mezquiteros*, Bolton gives, briefly, the only published systematic account of the early Texas Indians. Other partial accounts are found here and there in *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, the results of

researches in the Spanish records, by Barker and his pupils. Bolton's brief sketches, in *The Handbook of American Indians*, deserve also to be mentioned here. Fortunately, a large quantity of these old Spanish records are now available for study in this country, in the libraries of the Universities of California and Texas, and in the Library of Congress. When these have been adequately studied by competent ethnologists, we may hope yet to have, and that in spite of our past indifference and neglect, a creditable account of early Texan Indian ethnology; that is, as far as untrained missionary and Spanish official observation is able to furnish such an account. This piece of research needs urgently to be done.

A valuable ethnological record of the early Louisiana tribes has recently been recovered from the files of the Treasury Department at Washington, and published by the Heye Museum of New York City. This is a report to President Jefferson, from Dr. John Sibley, the Indian agent at Natchitoches, on Red River, in the year 1807. While not extensive, it contains valuable, sometimes detailed, ethnological materials on the Indian tribes of Louisiana, eastern Texas, eastern Oklahoma, and southern Arkansas. Its recovery was hailed with delight by ethnologists, and is an indication of the possibilities that yet lie in the old Spanish records.

When all ethnography of primitive peoples has been finally written out and published, anthropologists will necessarily give larger attention to the great primary races in their mutual relations at the present time. The Southwest has large contingents of three old primary races: the dominant white, the negro, and the Mexican. Most Mexicans of this country are pure blood Indian, or nearly so. The world has long looked, in vain, to the United States for light upon the problems of essential race characteristics, and race meanings. We should, long since, have worked out the important facts of comparative race anatomy and physiology, but, as a matter of fact, we have done almost nothing in this field. What has been done, has been done by Europeans, working among the primitives a long way from home, usually in the

tropics, and necessarily without laboratory equipment. This study has been confined, therefore, to the skin and superficial characters, for which the living could be used, or to the skeleton. Almost nothing is known of the relative splanchnology of races, and, in light of recent discoveries in the functions of the ductless glands, we may reasonably expect to get light upon some of the most important racial characters by such study. We know that hormones are accountable for much display of animal energy, and the remarkable industry and power of endurance under strain, displayed by the Chinese, in contrast with the equally remarkable laziness of the Malays, may be found to lie in the relative size and activity of certain glands. Even the foresight and thrift of whites, in contrast with the improvidence and shortsightedness of negroes, may likewise be found to originate in anatomy and physiology. Enough is known of comparative splanchnology to lead us to expect as serious differences in the relative size and functional vigor of internal organs as in the external characters of races.

Certainly, we should be learning, through the most dependable and scientific study, just what progress negroes and Mexicans are making in assimilating white American culture, and, where their progress is disappointingly slow, we should seek to find the real explanation of this fact. It is only in this way that we shall be able to make the best of our race tangle. Certainly, nothing is to be gained by the application of Christian Science methods to the solution of race problems; viz., by declaring that there is no such thing as race, or that race has no meaning, no importance, and, therefore, that the solution to race problems is to deny their existence.

We should also learn, as rapidly and as completely as we can, what are the native racial differences in mentality. Such a study should be removed as far as possible from any suggestion of propaganda in the interests of current dogmas concerning racial equality or inequality. It may well turn out that races, such as whites and Chinese, for instance,

differ mentally, as much as, or more than, physically, without either being judged inferior to the other.

The exclusion from this country of Japanese, Chinese, or Indian coolies does not necessarily carry with it any implication of inferiority. It may be true, and the writer is inclined to think it is true, that such peoples cannot be easily assimilated into a white population, and that they would long remain, if they came in numbers, essentially Orientals, living the life of the lands from which they came. They would constitute blocks dangerous to a democratic society, if they did not constitute a completely separate and distinct society. These results might obtain, through the influence of purely social inheritance, even if ultimately it should be concluded that distinctive types of society have no relation to biological or racial inheritance. However, it is the writer's opinion that types of society are too highly divergent, and too suggestive of biological adaptation to environment, to admit of the probability that they are unrelated to racial temperament and inherited character.

The effects of miscegenation could be studied to excellent advantage in Texas, where the three races are so largely represented, and where crossings can be found among all the race elements of the State. As between negroes and whites, of course, Arkansas and Louisiana afford equal opportunities for such study, and Oklahoma probably has, at present, a much larger white-Indian population than pure Indian, and would furnish, therefore, some excellent materials for such study.

Of course, not all the problems involved in such studies belong entirely to anthropology; physiologists, psychologists, and sociologists should coöperate in their solution; but, that they are essentially in the field of anthropology, the writer feels will be conceded by persons who are well informed as to the province allotted that science by scientists in other fields throughout Europe, and, for the most part, in this country.

The extent and effects of acclimitization of Europeans to the geography of this country might be studied, perhaps, to advantage, and in no part of the country could this study

be made to better advantage than in the Southwest. Here the climatic conditions differ from those of Europe more radically than anywhere else in the United States. The effects of climates upon races, alien to them, was never so important a problem as at the present time. Race migrations have occurred during the last three centuries on a larger scale than ever before in the history of mankind, and we ought now to be determining whether the adaptation which we know sometimes takes place, as, for instance, of the Aryan whites in India, and of the Hamitic whites in Africa, is the result of natural selection, or of some other form of modification which does not involve elimination.

Some aspects of eugenics, within our white population, we might well undertake to study. We share, in the Southwest, with the rest of the world, certain evidences of racial deterioration that justify, if they do not demand, research along eugenic lines. War, tastes for luxuries, and over emphasis of individual desires and interests at the expense of social interests, tend steadily to eliminate the vigorous, intelligent, efficient elements of all ambitious and successful peoples. These elements make up the small percentage of exceptional individuals who are the natural leaders, the pathfinders, of progressive peoples, and their elimination can only bring an end to progress, and must mean, ultimately, national decay of the elimination is carried sufficiently far. It is the opinion of all eugenicists, and of many anthropologists, that the elimination of this element has been the chief source of national decay throughout past ages. The tendency of the ambitious elements of our rural population to migrate to cities, where professional or economic success brings love of luxury, restriction of the birth rate, and gradual elimination, is a universal phenomenon generally remarked among the white peoples at the present time.

In Texas, the writer is sure, despite the absence of scientific investigation into the matter, that he has noticed a very perceptible change for the worse in the character of the rural population. In many black-land counties, 75 per cent of the farmers at present are landless tenants, who

are coming, as many believe, to resemble closely the stolid, thriftless, ox-like peasantry of continental Europe. Their birth rate is high, in itself an evidence of improvidence, and, taken with the low birth rate of the ambitious and more efficient elements, means that in each succeeding generation they constitute, proportionally, an ever larger part of the population at large. This movement, and similar factors, must be taken to explain the astonishing fact, brought out by the draft, that 30 per cent of our population are so defective mentally or physically that they must be carried, socially and economically, by the remainder of the population.

The field of eugenics is not the province solely of the anthropologist. True, the eugenic movement was begun by Francis Galton, an anthropologist, but it has been taken up by the biologists, and the sociologists and psychologists are necessarily deeply interested. Specialists from all these fields have the right, perhaps the duty, of investigating eugenic problems.

Finally, the study of old mental attitudes which are incident to culture complexes, or long established beliefs and practices, contains in it some of the most pressing problems of anthropology, sociology, and psychology. The folklore of the Mexican and negro elements of the Southwest, and of all the many varieties of the white race found in this section, should be gathered and recorded for study. Such study will give us one of the best means of judging the extent and form of social modification going on in our complicated cosmopolitan population.

When we consider the present commercial, interracial, and international situations in the world at large, we are driven to the conclusion that we cannot be too diligent in arriving at dependable conclusions about (1) the extent and meaning of race differences, (2) the effects of the persistence of old mental attitudes, and how and why these are maintained, (3) the effects of miscegenation, and (4) the possibilities and forms of acclimatization. Such conclusions must lie at the base of any intelligent immigration policy, and be the guiding principles of the progressive peoples in dealing

with colonial possessions containing large elements of backward peoples. The following facts, new to the world, so new that their implications cannot yet be figured out, put heavy emphasis on anthropological study and research: The whites now rule seven-eighths of the habitable earth, while constituting only about one-fourth of its population. Whites are going in ever-increasing numbers into alien, usually tropical, environments, for rubber, tobacco, tropical fruits, hard woods, metals, oil, etc., and to stop this movement, or to seriously modify it, is not possible, even if it could be proved to be desirable. World trade is highly unified, and markets and sources of raw materials are now essential to the very existence of industrial peoples like the British. In nearly all lands, where there is a semblance of order, population is increasing, and many lands like India, China, and Japan are now seriously overcrowded. Their leaders are looking about in vain for regions suitable for colonization of their surplus population. All these conditions are being constantly intensified, and, as a consequence, national jealousies and rivalries are increasing in intensity yearly. To study the problems involved in these new conditions, is a part of the social and human engineering which will probably constitute the largest scientific endeavor of the Twentieth Century, and it is the writer's opinion that the methods and past achievements of anthropology entitle it to a large share, if not a major share, in this study. The increasing demand for anthropology in the universities—several state universities inaugurated courses in anthropology during the last scholastic year—indicates a growing recognition of this claim.

THE MOVEMENT FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF STATE ADMINISTRATION IN TEXAS

FRANK M. STEWART
University of Texas

Until 1907, no real survey of the state government to determine whether its organization, business methods, and procedure were economical and efficient had been made. In 1901, however, notice had been taken of the increasing cost of government in a resolution adopted by the Twenty-seventh Legislature:

The constantly increasing cost of government demands a rigid investigation of the method of expending the public money in the different institutions and departments, to the end that the Legislature and the executive may be fully informed as to where expenditures may be curtailed and efficiency promoted.¹

A joint committee of two senators and three representatives was appointed to conduct the investigation of state departments and institutions. No constructive recommendations were made by the committee, and the effect on the conduct of the state's business was slight.²

The Thirtieth Legislature, 1907, created a Board of State Accounting, consisting of the Governor, Secretary of State, and Chairman of the Railroad Commission.³ Power was conferred on the board to make an investigation and audit of the accounts and methods of bookkeeping and business procedure in the Comptroller's Department, Treasury, General Land Office, Penitentiaries, and other departments, if advisable. Authority was given to employ a firm of accountants, and the firm of Gunn, Richards & Company of New York City was engaged. On January 22, 1909, they made a report on their investigation of the departments of the Comptroller, Treasurer, and Commissioner of

¹*House Journal*, 27th Leg., 2d called sess. (1901), p. 31.

²*Report of State Investigating Committee*, 1902, p. 3.

³*Laws*, 1907, pp. 52-54.

the General Land Office. Short sections of the report were devoted to school funds, location of offices, appropriations, uniform accounting, filing, reports, stationery and printing and state institutions and purchases.⁴

"As a result of their recommendations, the Treasury Department was reorganized and changes made in the General Land Office in 1909, and the Comptroller's Department was reorganized in 1910."⁵

Beginning with 1917, at every session of the Legislature, administrative reorganization has had the attention of both the executive and the legislative branches of the government. The movement for administrative reorganization since 1917 will be discussed in some detail.

I

CENTRAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE

At the third called session of the Thirty-fifth Legislature, September, 1917, it was pointed out by the authors of a simple resolution in the House, that there would be little likelihood of general legislation during the session, on account of the impeachment trial in the Senate, and that

There has arisen, and now exists, a public suspicion, indeed in some instances solemn charges have been made, that in certain departments and institutions of this State, there are irregularities, unlawful practices and violations of those fundamental principles which must be preserved as the foundation of our government, and remain the basis of the public policies of this state.⁶

Subsequently, a resolution was adopted creating a Central Executive Committee of the House, composed of ten members appointed by the Speaker, this committee to be divided

⁴*Report on Audit, Organization, and Methods, 1909.*

⁵E. T. Miller: *A Financial History of Texas*, (Univ. Tex. Bull., 1916), p. 382.

⁶*Reports of Sub-Committees of the Central Investigating Committees of the House and Senate, Third Called Session of the Thirty-Fifth Legislature of Texas, 1918, VII.*

into ten sub-committees, with one member of the Central Executive Committee as Chairman and one other member of the House appointed by the Speaker. Broad powers of investigation were given to the committee with regard to all of the offices and employes, departments, institutions, and enterprises of the State Government, and among the purposes specified in the general grant of powers to the committee was to see, "Whether or not there should be consolidation, elimination of departments, commissions, boards, boards of regents, and trustees."⁷

At the same special session of the Legislature, a Senate Committee of Investigation was created, composed of ten Senators to be appointed by the presiding officer. Ten sub-committees were organized, each of which coöperated with the corresponding House Committee. The Senate Committee was given authority to ascertain:

What officers, commissions, and departments and institutions may be abolished, or combined with other positions, in order to reduce the number of employes in departments and institutions, and what, if any, changes are necessary in the methods of bookkeeping and keeping the records, in order to simplify the same, and thereby reduce the expense of keeping same; to recommend such change as it deems best, in the methods used by any department or office; and in its report, said committee shall specifically point out and specify such offices and positions, as, in its judgment, may be abolished or combined, and such changes as it deems necessary and advisable, and in its said report shall state what the expense of the present method is, and the estimated expense of the methods proposed, showing in what manner the saving is made, and the amount that will be saved to the State, if said proposed change is adopted, and shall recommend such laws and changes in existing laws as it deems necessary to put into effect such changes as are set out in said report.⁸

Organization of the committees was completed on November 1, 1917. All departments, offices, and institutions of the State were divided among the ten sub-committees,

⁷*Ibid.*, XI.

⁸*Ibid.*, XIII.

and the work of investigating was prosecuted with diligence for over sixty days. Reports of all sub-committees were reviewed by the Central Committees, and the House and Senate Committees completed their work on February 1, 1918. The joint report of the Central Investigating Committees was printed in the *Journal* of the fourth called session of the Thirty-fifth Legislature on March 11, 1918.⁹

This session authorized the printing of the reports of the sub-committees, and they were printed in a separate volume of 950 pages.¹⁰

The investigation included every administrative department of the State Government, the educational and eleemosynary institutions, the prison system, and the Legislature and judiciary. Many specific recommendations regarding the work of the different departments and institutions were made, but for the purposes of this study, only the recommendations regarding the abolition or consolidation of administrative departments, and general improvements in methods of administration will be considered.

Recommendations for Administrative Consolidations.—

First among the recommendations for consolidation, was that for the abolition of the offices of State Purchasing Agent, State Expert Printer, and Printing Board, State Inspector of Masonry, Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, and the governing boards of the eleemosynary institutions, and for the creation of a single board of three members, to be called the "Purchasing and Managing Board," to be appointed by the Governor, with the consent of the Senate, for six years, to perform all the duties of the offices abolished. This board, in addition, should prepare the biennial budget for the State departments and institutions, and install uniform methods of accounting and auditing for the institutions and departments under its control. Next, it was recommended that all agricultural agencies should be consolidated with the Department of

⁹"Joint Report of the Central Investigating Committee" in *House Journal*, 35th Leg., 4th called sess. (1918), pp. 228-258.

¹⁰*Supra*, p. 231.

Agriculture. These agencies were: Board of Water Engineers, Reclamation Engineer, Live Stock Sanitary Commission, State Veterinarian, Warehouse and Marketing Department, and State Entomologist. It was also recommended that agricultural work that is educational in nature should be performed by the Agricultural and Mechanical College, and that work that is administrative in nature should be performed by the Department of Agriculture. On this basis, the lecture work, home economics work, and farm demonstration work of the Department of Agriculture should be transferred to the Agricultural and Mechanical College, and the administration of the laws relating to pure food control, fertilizer inspection, foul brood control, and inspection of apiaries should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

Other recommendations for consolidation of departments were: (1) Offices of Pension Commissioner, Revenue Agent, and Tax Commissioner, should be consolidated with the Comptroller's Department; (2) Industrial Accident Board, Mining Board, and Inspector of Mines, with the Labor Department, the Industrial Accident Board to consist of the Labor Commissioner, the Insurance Commissioner, and the Attorney General; (3) Pure Food Department and Pasteur Institute, with the Health Department; (4) Highway Department should be placed under a single commissioner elected by the Railroad Commission; (5) Fire Insurance Commission, with the Department of Insurance and Banking; (6) Assistant Attorney General in the Court of Criminal Appeals, with the Attorney General's Department; (7) abolition of Intangible Tax Board, and division of its work between the Comptroller and Railroad Commission; (8) creation of a board of examiners of Land Surveyors, with the Commissioner of the General Land Office as a member; (9) abolition of the Governing Board for Agricultural Experimental Sub-stations, and placing the sub-stations under the control of the Board of Directors of the Agricultural and Mechanical College; and, (10) management of Prison System should be placed under a general manager, selected by the Commission and the

Governor—Prison Commission should be supervisory, and not executive commission.

Recommendations Regarding Business Methods of State.—In its investigation of the business methods and practices of the different departments, particularly in the handling of State funds, as disclosed by its audits, the committee found a lack of uniformity, and some irregularities, in bookkeeping and accounting. In some cases, restoration of State funds, improperly expended, was demanded; in others, discontinuance of certain practices. Specific legislation was recommended to effect a number of improvements in business methods and practices. In a few cases, officials were censured, and some were recommended for removal or impeachment.

The principal recommendations for improvement in methods of administration, were that:

A uniform system of bookkeeping and accounting be installed in the State departments;

Frequent inspection and audits be made by State auditors;

Appropriation bills be itemized, so that funds appropriated for one purpose cannot be used for another;

The employment of an attorney by any department without the consent of the Attorney General be prohibited;

The Governor be prohibited from authorizing the issuance of deficiency warrants for State institutions and departments in excess of the legislative appropriation, or that such deficiencies should be limited to not more than 10 per cent of the amount in the appropriation bill for that purpose;

All departments collecting money for the State should be required by law to clear their collections through the State Treasury;

All claims against the State should be properly verified, audited, and approved before being passed or vouchered for payment;

A system of accounting be adopted to prevent abuse of appropriations made for traveling expenses;

A central stamp division be established, to purchase

stamps and stamp all mail from the Capitol and Land Office Building;

All State officers collecting State money should be required to deposit funds in the State Treasury or depository daily, or at specified intervals;

Money contained in special funds should be turned into the general revenue fund, and future accruals to such funds should be deposited in the general revenue, and an account kept, and payments for such purposes should be paid out of the general revenue;

The Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds should be required to make an inventory of all personal property belonging to the State, and keep a record of same in his office;

The number of copies of departmental reports be reduced by at least one-third to one-half;

Institution storekeepers be furnished by the Purchasing Agent with samples of supplies purchased under contract; and

Chemical analysis should be made of food supplies.

General Recommendations.—In addition to the recommendations for administrative reorganization and consolidation and improvements in methods of administration to be effected by uniform accounting and auditing, centralized purchasing and printing and budget making, several subcommittees indicated in their reports that they favored: (1) a constitutional convention to make many changes not possible through legislation; and (2) a civil service law "to test the efficiency of employes in the different departments, and retain their services without exposing them to the danger of being dismissed for political reasons."

*Economies to Be Effected.*¹¹—Savings, immediate and annual, were predicted by the committee, if its recommendations were adopted. Total immediate savings of \$871,923.95 were possible through:

¹¹Joint Report, *op. cit.*, pp. 255-257.

Funds discovered through audit.....	\$ 11,923.95
Transfer of quarantine to Federal Government.....	210,000.00
Repeal of appropriations for new normal schools and Junior A. and M. College.....	650,000.00

Annual savings were estimated as follows:

Through operation of Board of Control in central- ized purchasing, printing, auditing, budget making, and control of eleemosynary institutions.....	\$250,000.00
Through operation of new depository law.....	150,000.00
Through departmental consolidation, reorganiza- tions, and reform of business methods.....	599,694.00
Total estimated annual saving.....	\$999,694.00

II

REORGANIZATION IN THE THIRTY-FIFTH AND THIRTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURES

Action by the Fourth Called Session, 35th Legislature.—On March 11, 1918, Governor Hobby submitted to the fourth called session of the Thirty-fifth Legislature portions of the report of the Central Investigating Committee relating to the following departments: Legislature, Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Secretary of State, Comptroller, Treasurer, Land Office, Attorney-General, Assistant Attorney-General, Judiciary, Trial Courts, Eleemosynary Institutions, and State Purchasing Agent.¹²

Only two measures of consolidation were passed at this session—the offices of Commissioner of Pensions and State Revenue Agent were abolished and their duties transferred to the Comptroller.¹³

Endorsement by the Democratic State Convention, 1918.—The State Democratic Convention at Waco in August, 1918, endorsed the recommendations of the Central Investigating Committee, as follows:

Resolved, by the Democratic Party in State Convention assembled, That we most earnestly request the Thirty-sixth

¹²*Senate Journal*, 35th Leg., 4th called sess. (1918), pp. 151-152.

¹³*Laws*, 35th Leg., 4th called sess. (1918), pp. 190, 197.

Legislature to enact into law the recommendations of said investigating committee of the Thirty-fifth Legislature, to the end that all unnecessary board and commissions be abolished, and such combinations be effected as contained in the committee's report.¹⁴

Governor Hobby's Recommendations to Thirty-sixth Legislature.—In his biennial message to the regular session of the Thirty-Sixth Legislature, Governor Hobby recommended the report of the investigating committees and urged "the Legislature to make a careful inquiry into the departments of the State Government and the functions they are performing, to the end that your body may abolish those offices and departments which are useless and unnecessary and which burden the taxpayers of the State."

A warning was sounded by the Chief Executive regarding the transfer of one department to another:

To transfer one department from another, does not necessarily mean economy. In fact, it is frequently camouflage to use such a method of abolishing an office. Where the transfer of the duties of one department to another would better the service, that method is commendable, but when it is found feasible to abolish an office, it should be abolished without substituting for it that which will also constitute an expense.¹⁵

Two other governmental reforms found favor with the Governor—the budget system and the merit system. Contrasting the budget system with the "Pork Barrel System" found in the National Congress and in Texas as well, the Governor said:

One of the greatest needs of our State Government, in my judgment, is the introduction of a more business-like method of making appropriations. Perhaps the worst feature of the pork-barrel method of appropriations, is that the legislators are working in the dark. There is no committee of either House, or any member of either House, who knows, or who can know, how much is being appropriated by the various

¹⁴Reports, *op cit.*, XXII.

¹⁵*House Journal*, 36th Leg., reg. sess. (1919), pp. 96-97.

bills in the process of enactment, or who knows, or can know, the amount of revenue that the State will receive under the existing and proposed tax laws. No private business in the world would succeed under such a blind, haphazard system of finance.

Recommending the adoption of the merit system in all State departments and institutions, the Governor said:

The constant removal in the clerical forces of the departments of those who have acquired knowledge of the State's business to make room for others, results in keeping the State's service in the hands of beginners. Under this system, the ship of State is forever manned by raw recruits.¹⁶

Board of Control Act.—At the regular session of the Thirty-sixth Legislature, 1919, one important consolidation act was passed—a Board of Control composed of three members appointed by the Governor and Senate was created.¹⁷ Members were appointed for six years, one member being appointed every two years and they were to receive salaries of \$5,000 per year. To this Board was transferred the duties relating to the various departments, boards, institutions and public offices abolished, and such additional duties as were required by the act. The act abolished the following agencies: State Purchasing Agent, Board to Advise with Purchasing Agent, State Expert Printer, Printing Board, State Inspector of Masonry, Public Building and Works, Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, and the boards of managers of seventeen eleemosynary institutions named in the act.

To perform these duties the Board could create six divisions of its work: Public Printing; Purchasing; Auditing; Design, Construction and Maintenance; Estimates and Appropriations; and Eleemosynary Institutions. It was authorized to employ a competent, experienced chief as head of each division.

The Board was required, through its Division of Esti-

¹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 93-95.

¹⁷*Laws*, 36th Leg., reg. sess. (1919), pp. 323-329.

mates and Appropriations, to prepare the biennial State budget.

Democratic Platform, 1920.—Administrative reorganization was again endorsed by the Democratic party in their platform of 1920:

We believe the State Government should maintain such departments and divisions as may be essential to answer, in an efficient manner, requirements of the public service, but do not favor the creation of departments where the service may be performed by existing agencies. We urge upon the Democratic Legislature the great importance of exercising the most rigid surveillance of the public service, to the end that unnecessary duplication in the service may be avoided, and that departments or agencies may be combined where practicable.¹⁸

III

REORGANIZATION IN THE THIRTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

Governor Pat M. Neff came into office in January, 1921, with the announced intention of carrying out the mandates of the party platform. One of his first official acts was to abolish the Board of Pardon Advisers, by calling for the resignations of its two members.

On January 27, 1921, in a special message to the Senate and House of Representatives, the Governor said:

The State has grown, in its governmental affairs, top-heavy. It is burdened with overhead expenses. We have too much machinery. The State needs less legislation and more coöperation. There should not be even one office for political purposes in all Texas. Politics and business should be divorced. At the earliest hour possible, there should be abolished every board and bureau, every office and commission, except just enough to administer the Government in a simple, economical manner. This is the only way to take up the slack and give the people a maximum service at a minimum cost.¹⁹

¹⁸*House Journal*, 37th Leg., reg. sess. (1921), p. 160.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 259-262.

The Governor then recommended a number of consolidations: (1) Division of agricultural functions so as to transfer to the Agricultural and Mechanical College and to the College of Industrial Arts those functions which are educational in nature and to the Department of Agriculture those functions which are administrative in nature, (2) transfer of Warehouse and Marketing Department to the Department of Agriculture, (3) consolidation of the Pure Food and Drug Department with the State Health Department, (4) transfer of duties of Intangible Tax Board and Tax Commissioner to the Comptroller and Railroad Commission, (5) abolition of Industrial Welfare Commission and the delegation of its functions to the State Department of Labor, (6) abolition of the Governing Board for Agricultural Experimental Sub-Stations and transfer of its duties to the Board of Directors of the Agricultural and Mechanical College, and (7) transfer of the duties of the Mining Board and Inspector of Mines to the Department of Labor.

Such a program of consolidation would save at least \$100,000 a year, and "set a higher standard of efficiency in the affairs of State."

On February 7, 1921, the Governor recommended the enactment of a law which would bring all departments of the State Government under the control of the Legislature for budget-making purposes, and take from every department the power to use State funds or fees in fixing the salaries and determining the number of departmental employees.

"It is not a wise policy to permit any officer of any department of the government to collect fees and to appropriate such fees as he pleases to the running expenses of his particular department. All public funds should not only be turned into the State Treasury, but should be paid out by direct and specific legislation." Such a policy of direct and specific legislation would curb extravagance, equalize salaries for like service, minimize the possibility of leaks and improve the efficiency of the government.²⁰

²⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 406-407.

In a message to the special session on July 27, 1921, Governor Neff said:

All duplications, each overlapping department, and every useless office in connection with the State Government should be abolished. We have too many boards, bureaus, and commissions. The State is burdened with governmental agencies. It is top-heavy. We have too much machinery, and consequently too much overhead expense. The Government should be simplified. There is no excuse for duplication and triplification of work.

If the people are to be given an effective government, if they are to be relieved from mounting taxes, we, their representatives, can make no better start than to begin by overhauling the administrative agencies of the State, wiping out some, consolidating others, reducing to a minimum the lengthy list of State employees. . . .

The principle of concentration and correlation should be applied to our State Government as it is applied to the business world.²¹

The Governor then renewed the recommendations for administrative consolidation made to the Legislature at the regular session.

The Governor said it was his opinion that there were too many State employees. He recommended the weeding out of every employee except just enough to operate the State Government with the same efficiency and economy as private business.

Referring to the "Army of Expensive Traveling Representatives" and to the traveling appropriation of approximately \$1,000,000 made by the last Legislature, the Governor said: "Perhaps the most reckless waste today of the people's money goes to the superfluous perambulating agents of the State. The government seems to have been put on wheels." He recommended laws to check this increasing expenditure.

Itemized and specific appropriations, in accordance with the constitutional provision, was the final recommendation of the Governor for economy in the administration.

²¹*House Journal*, 37th Leg., 1st called sess. (1921), pp. 82-84.

Two acts of consolidation were passed at the regular session of the Thirty-seventh Legislature—the Industrial Welfare Commission was abolished and the Dairy and Food Department was abolished and its duties transferred to the State Health Officer.²² An Act was passed authorizing the Legislature to make appropriations for the Highway Department, to fix the salary of the State Highway Engineer, and to determine the number and salaries of all other employees. The State Board of Control was authorized to make contracts for equipment and supplies.²³

The first called session abolished the Governing Board for Agricultural Experimental Sub-Stations and conferred the duties upon the Board of Directors of the Agricultural and Mechanical College.²⁴

IV

REORGANIZATION IN THE THIRTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATURE

Governor Neff made no recommendation for administrative consolidation to the Thirty-eighth Legislature, 1923. Nevertheless several bills were introduced to abolish and consolidate departments. None of these proposals was adopted. One act was passed carrying into effect a recommendation of the Central Investigating Committee of 1917—all special funds in the State Treasury were abolished and the moneys in such special funds transferred to the general revenue fund.²⁵ Several changes were made in the administrative organization, principally by the creation of ten new State boards and commissions.²⁶

²²*Laws*, 37th Leg., reg. sess. (1921), pp. 14, 225.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 102.

²⁴*Laws*, 37th Leg., 1st and 2d called sess. (1921), p. 148.

²⁵*Laws*, 38th Leg., 1st, 2d and 3d called sess. (1923), pp. 61-62.

²⁶Seven are permanent agencies: Board of Directors of Texas Technological College, Board of Examiners in Chiropody, Board of Plant Breeder Examiners, Historical Board, Parks Board, Washington State Park Commission, and Rate Making Board; temporary commissions include the Educational Survey Commission to supervise a

The first attempt to provide for an efficiency survey of the State administration was made in a bill by Representatives Hendricks and Mathes.²⁷ This bill proposed the creation of a Committee on Economy to be composed of three Senators, appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, such committee to have power to "direct an inquiry into the organization, structure, and the manner and method of administration of the various executive agencies of the State Government." The purposes of the investigation should be: (1) The formulation of constructive recommendations for the improvement of the State administration through the elimination of overlapping functions and through consolidation and coördination of executive departments; (2) improvement of working procedure of departments by application of principles of modern business administration; (3) improvement of financial, accounting, and auditing procedure, and strengthening of machinery of financial control; (4) compilation of data valuable in promoting efficiency and economy and in planning desirable reorganization of the State's affairs.

The Committee was to be given an appropriation of \$25,000 for its work and could "employ a reputable firm of management engineers fully experienced in the organization and administrative methods of government bodies, to conduct its investigations and advise in the preparation of its reports."

V

CONCLUSION

It will thus be seen that, while administrative reorganization in the interests of economy and efficiency, has had

survey of the entire educational system, for which an appropriation of \$50,000 was made; an Eleemosynary Commission to survey the eleemosynary institutions, and a Codification Commission to codify the State statutes.

²⁷House Bill No. 146, 38th Leg., May 4, 1923.

the attention of the Legislature several times since 1900, it is only since 1917 that increasing cost of State administration has made it a major legislative problem. Two governors, two Democratic Conventions, and four legislatures have endorsed the principle of administrative reorganization. Practically all of the candidates for Governor in the recent Democratic primary announced in favor of its application to the State Government.

Yet the results accomplished thus far are slight. With the exception of the Board of Control Act no major consolidations have been effected. One explanation of this situation is that no comprehensive plan of reorganization has yet been submitted. Several partial and piece-meal recommendations for consolidations have been made, but no complete study of the problem has been attempted. The proposal for an efficiency survey in the last session of the Thirty-eighth Legislature came nearer to a beginning of a scientific solution of the problem than anything yet proposed. But this proposal never came to a vote. Such a survey is necessary before any complete plan of reorganization can be formulated.

CALLING THE SECESSION CONVENTION IN ARKANSAS¹

DAVID Y. THOMAS
University of Arkansas

A few days after the election of Lincoln the Legislature of Arkansas met (November 15) in regular session at Little Rock. In his inaugural address Governor Henry Rector declared that the "irrepressible conflict" was on. The issue, the Union without slaves, or slavery without union, had been made by the North, and now dissolution must come. The passage of personal liberty laws by eleven states, designed to impede the operation of the fugitive slave law, was enough to justify secession. Reconciliation and compromise might possibly be effected by northern and southern conventions, but, should any state declare her independence, Arkansas ought not to withhold her sympathy and active support. In preparation for that day he advised the revision of the militia code.

The Legislature does not seem to have been greatly stirred by the Governor's secession message, but gave its attention to regular routine matters. Prominent men of the State, however, continued to stir up public interest by the methods used in regular campaigns. On several occasions the hall of the House of Representatives was turned over to individuals, such as Albert Pike and Colonel John R. Fellows, for speeches, while some made speaking tours over the State. Naturally the newspapers had a good deal to say about the "issues of the day."

As for what should be done, some favored secession, others called for a State convention to decide, still others for a Southern convention, while some opposed any action. Senator R. W. Johnson and T. G. Hindman—the latter had just been elected to Congress—were for secession, as was also E. W. Gantt, though the last named was not as urgent. Mass meetings were common over the State, some of which

¹Research Paper No. 13, Journal Series, University of Arkansas.

appear to have acted without any direct suggestion from prominent politicians, though it is impossible to be sure of this at this time. Most of them adopted resolutions which were sent to the Legislature and given to the press. Some of these meetings called for secession, a few opposed any precipitate action, but the most of them favored a convention.

Prominent among the opponents of secession were Senator W. K. Sebastian and W. M. Fishback. In an address to the people, the latter said: "Politicians, political extravagance, political bitterness, vituperation of opposing sections by the politicians of each, have brought on a momentous crisis." Complaint was made of the fugitive slave law. "But," said he, "we have the Constitution and laws, the Federal courts and police, and the obligations of official oaths; also, the army and the navy and thousands of friends scattered throughout the north to assist in enforcing the law. Would secession improve the situation? After secession a standing army of 50,000 men would not give any more security. Instead of mobs and a few hostile State laws, we should then have a great and powerful nation at our very door seeking to crush our institutions." It was objected that we had no protection in the territories. On the contrary, we now had a Democratic Congress, thousands of pro-slavery emigrants in the territories. Would secession and cowardly surrender of all the territory to the North afford the remedy for the evil? Instead of being a protection of slavery, secession would prove the shortest road to abolition. The *Arkansas State Gazette* warned that Arkansas was not pecuniarily or geographically prepared for secession. Her commercial interests were with Louisiana, but secession would mean war on her western border. Abolitionist enemies would then loose their Indians on her, and she would be subjected to organized murder and robbery from Kansas and the Territory. The *Van Buren Press* opposed secession on financial grounds and warned South Carolina that it would cost her millions to maintain her independence, entailing a new tax of \$33

per capita. The removal of Federal troops from Texas would throw upon that state an expense of \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 for defense. Senator Sebastian warned against secession except as a *last* remedy.

A public meeting at Pine Bluff, presided over by Colonel W. P. Grace, adopted resolutions drawn up by a committee of seven, ex-Governor J. S. Roane, Chairman. The resolutions declared that "a government hallowed by long years of trial and glorious memories should not be broken up for light and transient causes." The election of Lincoln was not sufficient cause for secession, but this was the culmination of a long series of abuses. A convention should be called and measures taken for safety. Thanks were due the people of the North who voted to sustain Southern rights. No "Black Republican" administration should be permitted to coerce any southern state by force of arms. Governor Roane spoke for an hour in defense of these resolutions. He was followed by Mr. A. A. C. Rogers, who deprecated the Governor's inflammatory remarks, but he supported the resolutions and they were adopted without a dissenting vote. A mass meeting at Columbia, Chicot County, declared that the election of Lincoln and Hamlin was a menace to southern institutions and that the people ought not to submit to it.

The action of only one religious body has come to the notice of the writer. The Methodist Conference in session at Van Buren adopted a resolution appointing the Friday before Christmas to be observed as a day of fasting and prayer "for the preservation of our political union."

Within the legislature, London, of Sebastian, admitted that the election of Lincoln was a calamity, but held that this did not justify secession. The secession of South Carolina or any other state would not justify Arkansas in following. In the impending crisis, it was our duty to maintain the Constitution and boldly assert our rights in the Union, where we could secure them better than when out. Then, if rights could not be secured, we should resist in conjunction with our sister states.

For some time after the election public opinion in the North and to some extent official opinion and action (or non-action) in Washington did not indicate strong measures against secession. Horace Greely, editor of the *New York Tribune*, a strong anti-slavery paper, came out against coercion of the cotton states, if they attempted to secede. Henry Ward Beecher and some of the abolitionists seem to have been of like mind. The commercial interests, whose trade would be injured by war, did not encourage stiff measures. In his annual message, President Buchanan admitted that the South had many grievances, chief of which was the personal liberty laws, and appealed to the North to cease anti-slavery agitation. He denied emphatically that any state had the right to secede, but also declared that he had no right to prevent it by coercion, that is, war.

About a week later, Ben T. Duval, of Sebastian, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, presented a bill for a convention and accompanied it with a report bitterly criticising the North and the "Black Republicans" in particular. He drew up twenty-two indictments against the Republican Party, among them five for prospective action, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, prohibition of inter-state slave trade, the repeal of the fugitive slave law, the remodeling of the Supreme Court, and negro equality. To crown all their misdeeds they had now elected Lincoln. The South had made many concessions, giving up the northwest territory and then all north of 36° 30', all to no avail. True, Buchanan had said that the United States had no right to coerce a state, but Lincoln would find a way. It now seemed certain that several states would secede. Arkansas could not remain an idle spectator. A State convention should be called and a Southern convention should be held at Memphis.

In all probability, he and Governor Rector were acting in concert, for soon after he finished reading his report, the Governor's secretary appeared with a special message.

In this, the Governor declared that the Union was practically gone forever, a prey to the "madness and fanaticism of its children." The southern states were now seceding. The border states were conservative—so was Arkansas. Missouri might divest herself of slavery, but Arkansas never could. Without it, her fertile fields would be deserts, and her people penniless and impoverished. The only thing left her was to cast in her lot with the lower south. If done before Lincoln was inaugurated, it would be accomplished peacefully, as guaranteed by Buchanan's message.

As for measures to be taken, he favored arming the militia and securing supplies, not for war, but because he believed in preparedness. The bringing in of negroes from other states should be prohibited. Some were advocating the suspension of the collection of debts to get back from the North what they had taken in slaves not surrendered to their owners, but he opposed this and favored paying to the last farthing. He questioned the propriety of electing a United States senator, as Arkansas would soon become out of the Union.

Clay, the great compromiser, was no more, but leading men in Congress were trying to find a way. Senator Weed's proposal was to pay for fugitives not returned and the extension of the line $36^{\circ} 30'$, recognition of slavery south of that line. Senator Crittenden, of Kentucky, who was then occupying Clay's seat, now brought in three propositions as a basis for compromise: prohibition of slavery north of $36^{\circ} 30'$, recognition of slavery south of that line, and the admission of states on either side of the line with or without slavery as each should decide for itself.

It looked for a while as if the current of northern opinion was running strongly for the Crittenden resolution. For a time Seward wavered, but, after an indirect consultation with Lincoln, he announced that he could not support them. At this juncture Johnson and Hindman telegraphed the situation as they saw it from Washington: That the cotton states would secede, the border states were calling conventions, and that there was no hope of salvation from

Congress, and advised the calling of a convention to enable the people to join the common councils of the South.

The pressure upon the Legislature from the outside steadily increased. More mass meetings were held and commissioners arrived from Mississippi and Alabama. A motion was made not to elect a United States Senator, but this was defeated 23 to 72. Dr. Charles B. Mitchell was then elected to succeed Robert W. Johnson, who was not a candidate for re-election.

By this time, South Carolina had withdrawn from the Union and other states had called conventions. Resolutions continued to come in—among them two very moderate sets from Van Buren and Fort Smith, deprecating hasty action, praying that the non-slave-holding states be given time to retrace their steps, opposing separate secession, but favoring a State convention with a power to appoint delegates to a Southern convention. But Monroe County was more radical. It deplored the election of Lincoln by a sectional vote and declared any people of a sovereign government that would commit their destinies to a power foreign to it by locality, antagonistic to its interests, and hostile to it in feeling were unworthy of the name of freeman, being in reality slaves. They further declared that South Carolina was justified in her action. They then concluded:

That under the present state of affairs, the only safe or practical course for the South to pursue, is the separate secession of each state for itself, to take effect on March 4, next, with the ordinance of secession conditioned: that if the North will consent by that time to give us good and sufficient constitutional guarantees of our rights and our honor, to-wit: the faithful execution of the law requiring the return of our fugitives from justice and of fugitive slaves—an efficient protection of our persons and property in the territories, or an equal participation in the same—our rights of property and person to be protected in the District of Columbia, in the forts, in the dock-yards, and upon the high seas, or wherever else the federal authority may exclusively extend—no interference with the slave trade between the different states, or in the same—no tariff, except on strictly

a revenue standard—no internal improvements by the general government, except for general defence, or the improvement of the harbors and rivers, traversing the different states with specified limitations—and a constitutional guarantee for the future—that in the election of a President and Vice-President of the United States, before they should be declared elected, that they should receive a plurality of the electoral vote of both slave and non-slave-holding states, or failing in this, a plurality of the votes of the representatives in the House, or of the senators of both sections, in addition to the present regulations of the Constitution; or the equivalent to these specifications, or such guarantees as may be agreed upon by a convention of the southern states, provided one should be assembled—then and in that event, the ordinance of secession, or the government established by it, to cease its force and effect, otherwise provision to be made for the union of the seceding states, and means of defence provided for.

A committee of thirteen had been appointed in August to consider the Crittenden resolutions. With the consent of the other Republican members, Seward announced the day before Christmas the utmost they were willing to concede, an amendment providing that the Constitution should never be so altered as to authorize Congress to abolish slavery in any state, and that Congress should recommend to the states the repeal of their personal liberty laws. In return, they demanded the amendment of the fugitive slave law so as to allow jury trial for fugitives.

December 26 commissioners arrived in Washington from South Carolina to demand recognition and the surrender of the forts in Charleston harbor. The next day it was learned that Major Anderson had moved his forces from Fort Moultrie to Fort Sumter for greater safety. The commissioners now demanded that he be ordered back. President Buchanan wavered for a time but finally refused to give any such order. He now reconstructed his cabinet, leaving out the southern members and prepared to send the *Star of the West* with supplies for Major Anderson. January 8 he sent to Congress a message somewhat shorter than the one of December 3. While still admitting that neither the executive nor Congress had any right to begin

an aggressive war upon any state, he now declared that he could not recognize the independence of any state, but that it was his right and duty to execute the laws of the United States in all the states, even to the extent of using the military force defensively against those who resisted the Federal officers and assailed Federal property.

The same day Johnson and Hindman issued an address to the people of Arkansas advising a convention to follow the other states in secession. If the Union was to be preserved, the least the South could accept, said they, was an amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing: (1) The recognition of the right of property in slaves in the slave states, the District of Columbia, and the territories and a requirement of Congress to protect it everywhere; (2) the admission of the territories as states with or without slavery when ready for statehood; (3) the right of the slaveholder to travel in and reside temporarily in free states with his property; (4) a prohibition on Congress to interfere with the slave trade between the states and in the territories; (5) a provision for the enforcement of the fugitive slave law of 1850 and a denial of representation in Congress to certain states until their personal liberty laws were repealed; (6) a provision making these guarantees and the representation based on three-fifths of the slaves forever unalterable. "Immediate secession," they concluded, "is the true and only path that leads to the reconstruction of the Union on a basis guaranteeing these rights."

Mississippi carried out this advice January 9, and the next day Senator Jefferson Davis told the North that the way to avoid war was to allow peaceable secession. The same day Florida seceded and Alabama did so on the 11th. The next day Seward, who, it had already been announced, was to be Secretary of State in Lincoln's cabinet, told a packed Senate chamber that there would be no further concessions. He would not support the Crittenden compromise, he did not even support the proposition to submit it to a popular vote, but suggested that a convention be called in

two or three years, when passions had cooled, to amend the Constitution.

The Arkansas Senate had already passed the convention bill, and it now passed the House, possibly before the members had received the address of Johnson and Hindman or the speeches of Davis and Seward. There were only fifteen votes in opposition, nearly all of them coming from counties where slave holders were comparatively few. The bill was promptly signed by the governor and became a law January 15. It directed the governor to call an election on February 18 at which the people should vote on the question of "convention" or "no convention" and also elect delegates to the said convention.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN TEXAS*

MAX SYLVIVS HANDMAN
University of Texas

The thirteenth annual meeting of the Texas Conference of Social Welfare opens upon a situation in the State of Texas which is, gradually but inevitably, growing to be in reality vastly different from the views of it which we, and many others, have taken. Until now, it has been the custom, and it still is in many quarters, to consider Texas as overwhelmingly a rural State. It has been held, and is still held by most people, that the social problems which confront Texas are primarily, if not exclusively, rural problems. It has been assumed that for a long time to come, the field for the social worker in Texas will be limited by the fact that social work, as generally understood, is primarily an urban phenomenon, and Texas has no urban problems to speak of. And appearances seem to bear out this general impression. Aside from the large cities in Texas, and not in all of these, social work, with the professional social worker at the head, plays, in the estimation of many people, quite an unimportant role.

But while many people were blissfully reveling in this rural worldliness, the situation has been changing under their very eyes, with a rapidity which takes one's breath away.

The difference between city and country is established by the census, and it is to be found at the point where a community exceeds the number of 2,500 people. Everything above that number is urban, everything below that is rural. On that basis, the population of the United States is given as slightly over 51 per cent urban. Of this urban population in the United States, 26 per cent, or one-fourth, is to be found in cities of over one hundred thousand. If we look at the census figures for Texas, we find that the urban population of our State is slightly over 32 per cent; that is,

*Presidential address, Oct. 26, 1924.

nearly a third of our population is urbanized, as against one-half for the United States as a whole. What is more, Texas is more urbanized than all the southern states, excepting Florida, and, if we include them in the southern states, Delaware and Maryland. It is nearly as much so as Louisiana, where the single city of New Orleans, with a population of nearly four hundred thousand, accounts for nearly two-thirds of the total urban population of Louisiana; it is more urbanized than Nebraska; more than all the mountain states, excepting Colorado, Utah, and Arizona; it is nearly on a par with Iowa, Kansas, and probably more than Missouri, where the two cities, St. Louis and Kansas City, take off 1,100,000 inhabitants from a total urban population of 1,600,000.

If, however, one were to think that a town of 2,500 inhabitants is too far from urbanization as it is generally understood, and it is far from presenting the social problems incident to urbanization, let us look at a few more figures—a thing which I do with apologies, realizing that when dealing with statistics, one should remember the injunction that statistics, like little children, should be seen and not heard.

Texas has a total population of 4,633,000, of which 1,512,000 is urban. Of this urban population, four cities, Dallas, San Antonio, Houston, and Fort Worth, total 563,000. I will leave it to the various chambers of commerce to decide which one has more, the general consensus is to the effect that the actual figures total more rather than less. This means that one-third of our urban population is exposed to conditions found in large cities—cities of over one hundred thousand. All these are the figures of four years ago—today, the probability, if not the certainty, is to the effect that the numbers are larger.

Next in order, we will consider the cities having a population of over thirty-five thousand. Of these, there are six: Austin, Beaumont, El Paso, Galveston, Waco, Wichita Falls. (I give them in the way in which they appear in the census.) Together, they amount to 276,000 inhabitants, or one-sixth of the total urban population.

Anyone who has had any experience with social problems knows that a small city, between thirty-five thousand and one hundred thousand inhabitants, can worry one with the most baffling and the most irritating problems of health and delinquency, of family disruption, of unemployment of old people and young children who need to be taken care of, that often leave the larger city a model of organization and efficiency in comparison. Finally, we have twenty other cities in Texas given in the census of 1920 as having a population of between ten thousand and twenty-five thousand inhabitants. These total about two hundred and eighty thousand people, or another sixth of our urban population, and, together with the other urban groups, they present a picture of a total urban population living in cities of over ten thousand amounting to 1,119,000, or more than 25 per cent of the total population of Texas.

Returning now for a moment to the small city of between ten thousand and twenty-five thousand, it is obvious that such a small urban unit should not present any unusually grave social difficulties. There is, of course, the usual problem of health, and there may be a certain amount of unemployment. A more serious problem is usually the problem of recreation, particularly for the young. How serious a problem this is, only those can understand who have lived in such a town, and who have been confronted by the problem of joy rides for young boys and girls, of the everlasting picture show, of gambling, and, recently, bootlegging; rumors of which reach one constantly in every small town all over this country. But, all of these are what one might call the normal social problems, and they go with a certain stability, and established ways, and a slow moving, slow growing population.

This is not the case with the Texas small cities, as this is not the case with Texas. In Texas, a fifth of the population comes from outside of the State, not including foreign born. For Texas, the percentage is higher than all the southern states, excepting Delaware, Florida, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. Of the large cities of Texas, Dallas has the highest number of inhabitants from outside of the State,

excluding foreigners about a third, and San Antonio has the lowest. This means that the large cities have about a third of their population from outside of the State. In the country, the percentage is somewhat lower than the percentage for the State. Now, what does all this mean? It means that there is a continuous influx of new people into Texas; a thing which we are all happy to see, because it means that Texas is growing; but it also means that the Texas urban communities are confronted with a continuous dislocation of the population; that this dislocation brings with it many cases of people who came here insufficiently prepared financially; that they create a housing problem; that they are a strain on the civic resources of our cities, which are not prepared to take care adequately of all the newcomers. In short, it means growing pains, and growing pains are recorded in the registers of the United Charities, of the hospitals, and of the cemeteries.

This continuous dislocation of the population is not the only thing that our Texas urban centers have to contend with. They have an additional source of maladjustment in the fact that our cities are so largely sprinkled with two groups who have difficulty in adjusting themselves to the environment: the negro and the Mexican.

Texas has nearly 16 per cent negro population, and nearly 6 per cent Mexican population. The large cities have from 25 per cent negroes in Houston to 9 per cent in San Antonio. The small cities have 32 per cent in Beaumont, 22 per cent in Galveston, 20 per cent in Waco, 19 per cent in Austin, 5 per cent in Wichita Falls, and only about 2 per cent in El Paso. Of the smaller cities, Corsicana has about one-fourth of its population composed of negroes; Denison, one-sixth; Greenville, one-fifth; Marshall, nearly one-half; Palestine, one-fourth; Paris, one-fifth; Port Arthur, one-sixth; Sherman, one-sixth; Temple, one-fifth; Texarkana, one-fourth, and Tyler, one-fifth.

I leave it to you to picture the state of our Texas cities with a negro population of from 32 to 16 per cent. We all know the sanitary conditions under which they are compelled to live; we know the conditions of employment,

illiteracy, and family disruptions which flourish there. Perhaps, it would be more appropriate to say, we all do not know, and especially appropriate to say that very few of us do care. But your social worker knows, and the citizens of the community interested in decent living conditions both know and care.

In addition to this condition of maladjustment, we have the further fact that a large percentage of the negro population is made up of transients, shifting from city to country, and from place to place, further complicating the problem.

Now, as to our Mexican population, Texas has a Mexican population given in the census as 251,000. We all know that this is lower than the actual number, for the reason that the census does not count Mexican children born in this country as Mexicans. It is probable that the Mexican population is more nearly over half a million. Even at the census figures, Texas has more than half of the total Mexican population in the United States. Nearly 50 per cent of this population came after 1910. Of this population of 251,000 Mexicans, the four large cities of Texas have nearly forty thousand, and the six small cities, nearly fifty thousand. There is no information available as to the number of Mexicans to be found in cities of under 25,000 inhabitants. The border towns, like Laredo, Corpus Christi, and Eagle Pass, and Del Rio, have large numbers, of course. The others, we do not know.

What role the Mexican plays in the problems of maladjustment in Texas, we can gain a general idea of by taking Austin as an example. Austin has neither too large nor too small a Mexican population. The United Charities of Austin handled last year 507 family cases; 329 of this number were white, 91 were negroes, and 87 were Mexicans. With a negro population of 7,000, we had 91 cases; with an estimated Mexican population of about 2,000, we had 87 cases. If the negro creates a problem, the Mexican creates even more of a problem, for two reasons: First, he does not speak English, and as such, he is at once a liability. For an individual who does not speak the language of the community in which he lives is immediately placed in a

disadvantageous position; second, because he is a casual laborer, and subject to migrations and dislocations peculiar to casual laborers; this means bad housing, unemployment, disrupted family life, and all the other evils. It is to be noticed, for example, that in the United States as a whole, the percentage of Mexican males to females is 131 males to 100 females. For Texas, we have 125 males to 100 females of all foreign born, where the Mexicans probably furnish the largest contingent. The only exception to this state of affairs is found in El Paso, where there are 83 males to 100 females.

From the standpoint of the social worker, this predominance of male numbers over females means, of course, a housing problem—it creates the boarding house situation; it also means family disruption, with the accompanying consequences. That the situation is not any worse here than among the Mexicans in Mexico, and is even better, does not touch our problem at all. And finally, as an indication of our utter indifference to the presence of the Mexican in our midst, I will only add this fact: that with the exception of New Mexico and Arizona, Texas has the largest percentage of aliens within its borders in the entire United States; the largest percentage of foreign born who have not taken out citizenship papers, or who have shown no interest in doing so. Of course, the largest contingent falls to the lot of the Mexican. But, is it not wise to consider a situation which makes no effort to find a place for nearly 10 per cent of our population within our body politic? And can we blame the Mexican for such a situation, knowing how he lives and works. Or should the blame fall upon us, who rule this State, and who dispose of its resources, and of its human beings, and of its present, and of its future destiny?

One more piece of evidence of the passing of the idyllic conditions, which many of us still think of when we think of Texas: We have fondly imagined that Texas cities are filled with small houses, owned by the people who lived in them, unencumbered by any mortgage, or not seriously so. The picture which floated before our eyes was the picture

of free manhood working in his vegetable garden; of children romping in a back yard. But, alas, the figures do not bear out this fond contention. The census counts the number of dwellings, and the number of individuals per dwelling. In this calculation, Texas turns out to be nearly as crowded, counting the number of individuals living in one house, as Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Maryland, West Virginia, and Florida, and more crowded than Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont; more than Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska; and more crowded than all the states west of the Rocky Mountains, excepting Utah. Dallas is proportionately more crowded than Columbus, Ohio; Memphis, Tenn., and Oakland, Cal. Fort Worth is more crowded than Indianapolis, than Kansas City, than Louisville. San Antonio is more crowded than New Orleans; Houston is more crowded than Los Angeles; Wichita Falls is nearly as crowded Pittsburgh, and El Paso is more crowded than Cleveland. How strange this sounds in Texas, where we speak of land in millions of acres. Fortunately, this crowding does not and cannot create here a condition nearly, or even remotely, as trying as that of the northern cities, for the reason that our climate compels us to live with open doors and windows, or shun the inside altogether, preferring the sleeping porch. But while it does not create a problem in hygiene, it creates a problem in morals; for you cannot herd people together in this fashion—men, women and children—without doing violence to privacy, a condition essential to that reticence which lies at the foundation of our moral code; not to say a word about the irritation engendered in people who are constantly falling over each other and getting in each other's way.

Now, finally, the last piece of evidence to rouse us from our self-complacency about our social conditions: There are only thirteen states in the Union where a larger percentage of the population lives in rented houses than in the State of Texas. More than one-half—57 per cent, to be exact—of all homes in Texas are rented. In the large cities, the situation is noticeably more serious; but who

would have suspected that Dallas should have, proportionately, as many rented homes as Cleveland; Fort Worth, more than Detroit; Houston, more than Milwaukee; and San Antonio, more than Philadelphia.

It is, of course, not at all my intention to alarm you, even if with our charming and easy-going ways that were possible. The work of social service is not accomplished by the haste and the futile gestures of an alarmed person. The social worker has found, from bitter experience, that he cannot afford to be carried off his feet by the natural impulses of sympathy and pity, nor be distracted by the cries of the irritable and well-intentioned. Dealing with human beings who are in distress, is altogether too delicate a task for one not to have full and complete control over himself when doing so. But the social worker in Texas is asking that if he is to do the work which the whole community is so eager to see done when its heart-strings are touched, then the community must put at his disposal the necessary means with which to do it. To stick our heads in the sand and cry aloud that Texas is a rural community with no problems to solve, and then when the problem stares them in the face, to wring their hands and cry aloud, "In heaven's name, let us do something," is a situation beyond human energies to cope with. We all want Texas to grow, to become in fact the empire state which it is now in name, to have large millions of population, and long rows of skyscrapers and factories—in a word, everyone is eager for progress. But few of us realize that progress has to be paid for, and the price is a human scrap heap that will pile up on us until our road is clogged, and our most precious human sentiments become so weary and worn that a scalping Indian is a Good Samaritan by the side of our modern civilized city dweller. The business man in his mad rush to produce and to sell and to buy, is annoyed when the social worker comes to him for the smallest kind of help: financial help, and yet, it is his mad rush and his eagerness to build up his business, and to outstrip his competitor, which is creating a situation making for the things that the social worker has to contend with. We are giving all the blue ribbons and all

due praise to the wonderful accomplishments of the business man, but why not realize that the social worker stands right by his side, and heals the wounds which his energy is, perhaps, inevitably opening, and raising the fallen who cannot keep up with his, perhaps, unnecessarily fast pace. The social worker makes a great deal of our modern industrial civilization possible. So, in the name of common decency, I say: Let us be fair.

THE ECONOMICS AND POLITICS OF THE AGRICULTURAL TARIFF

CLARENCE A. WILEY
University of Texas

THE MOVEMENT TOWARD PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURE

A new era in agriculture was fast approaching at the outbreak of the Civil War, and post-war conditions hastened its coming. Soon after the war, production began to be localized to a much greater extent than formerly, which meant the one-crop system and commercialized agriculture, depending not so much on gross production as upon net money returns from the price system. Railways were being rapidly extended into unsettled regions, enabling an enormous acreage to be added to the cultivated area. Production was limited only by the weather and the initiative and energy of the American farmer, both of which factors were conducive to large production. But the farmer no longer ate what he grew or bartered it for other products, but he sold it for a price which was determined, in the main, by conditions in the world market. Relatively, production outran demand, prices fell to unheard of figures, and agriculture was sorely depressed.

But the same situation had not befallen industry in general, and prices of commodities other than agricultural products did not fall correspondingly low. Capital was increasing, railways were being built, manufactures sprang up everywhere, and integration in industry went on apace. Actual facts painted a picture of marked contrasts. Surely the farmer was no longer sharing the prosperity of the manufacturer.¹

What he sold went cheap and what he bought came relatively dear. To him interest rates were high, freight

¹The protectionist theory held that the prosperity of industry resulting from the tariff would be diffused among the agricultural class by building up a home market through high wages.

rates bore heavily upon him, and his home market seemed a myth.² Monopolies managed to multiply and thrive, money and credit got tight, and commercial crises came with their further depressing effects.

Out of the chaos and confusion the farmer sought fundamental causes and remedies, but he found neither. Never, perhaps, was there greater opportunity for wise and constructive statesmanship. But it did not appear. Instead, special interests were seeking protection, industrial "war babies" were demanding support, and at the same time state and national elections had to be carried. The situation was not greatly different from that existing this year in the middle west, and which prompted the remark that in the recent presidential election the "straw vote" was not nearly so important as the "wheat" vote.

The farmers saw the cause of their distress in favoritism and monopoly privilege.³ Their remedies were to lower excessive freight rates, curb monopolies, and reduce the tariff rates, which they believed constituted a strong prop to monopoly privilege.⁴ Especially in the West this feeling against monopolies and the tariffs of Civil War days was very strong, due mainly to the depressed condition of agriculture.

But the West had also been the political stronghold of the protectionist party. The question of paramount importance to this party was how to carry national elections and remain committed to a protectionist policy, while the agricultural class in the West was losing faith in the doctrine that "a prosperous agriculture is dependent upon prosperous manufactures." There was among them a growing but ill-defined feeling that somehow the proposition should be stated the other way round. The immediate

²In spite of the tariff, it appeared that the farmer could never get more for his wheat, cotton, and animal products than the prevailing European price, less transportation costs.

³Martin, E. W., *History of the Grange Movement; or, the Farmer's War Against Monopolies*, chaps. 15, 16.

⁴Periam, J., *A History of the Origin, Aims, and Progress of the Farmers' Movement*, chap. 39.

political problem was to placate these western farmers and their representatives, but under no circumstances was the protective policy to be given up.

DUST IN THE FARMERS' EYES

A policy of protection to manufacturing had been the remedy for agriculture, and it must remain the remedy. But if the remedy is not getting the desired results, it is because it has been too sparingly applied. In such a case the remedy is more of the remedy. The program of the protectionists was then to extend the benefits of their system by giving the farmer protection on his commodities also.⁵ The indirect protection he had previously received—through the prosperity of the manufacturers—was no longer able to bring the sort of prosperity which the agricultural class was now demanding.⁶ Henceforth, it was to share directly in the benefits of protection along with the manufacturers. In many cases, at the same time, the protection to manufacturers was to be still farther extended in order to more securely safeguard the home market and bring a greater shower of indirect benefits to the agricultural class. In accord with this program agriculture was given a degree of protection, by 1883, on sugar, wool, flax, beef, pork, hams and bacon, lard, butter, cheese, wheat, corn, oats, rice, and barley; but previous to that time the excessive war duties had been raised on many manufactured products, such as woolen goods, copper ore and ingots, steel and steel products, marble, nickel,⁷ and a number of other products.⁸

⁵The only genuine competition which the farmer met at that time was in the European market. A tariff on his products could wall in his producing area, but leave his markets unprotected.

⁶Smith, Steve, *Grains for the Grangers*, chap. 16.

⁷The two latter products have practically no competition in the United States, and when competition from abroad is cut off, the position they occupy is not an unprosperous one.

⁸Taussig, F. W., *The Tariff History of the United States*, 6th ed. (1913), pp. 194-250.

As far as any significance of these duties on most of these agricultural products, either to the agricultural producer or the consumer, they were at that time of no economic importance whatever. They served only to throw dust in the farmer's eyes, and foster in him a sort of pacific feeling that he was sharing the benefits of the protective system. On the other hand, duties on many manufactured articles were manipulated to effect marked increases which were hidden behind re-classifications, mixed ad valorem and specific rates, or compensatory duties.

It is true, that by 1883 there was some apparent concession to opponents of the protective system. In the first place, there came reductions in the non-protective, or revenue duties, such as on tea and coffee. In the second place, excessive prohibitive rates were reduced in several instances to less prohibitive rates. This was the case with pig iron, bar iron, steel rails, copper, cheap grades of cotton goods, and a few other articles. But in few instances, if any, was there any degree of real protection sacrificed. However, when the pruning knife reached the agricultural duties some of the duty on barley and on rice was lopped off, the only duties that at that time could be of much significance in protecting the agricultural producer. The duty on each of the other farm products was left without reduction, since they were harmless political playthings, and served as a "pacifier" to the unprosperous farmer, especially in the grain and livestock belt.⁹ In these products, grain and livestock, America was one of the world's leading exporters. An extremely high rate on these products was no better than no rate at all because we were exporting great surpluses of these commodities. The protection the farmer got was in counterfeit dollars; he could not cash in on it. It is true, an import duty, at the time, on grains caused a slight adjustment in the border trade with Canada, but a trade equal to only about one per cent of the grain production of the whole country. Therefore, as far as they were able to help the agricultural producer get higher

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 248.

prices for his farm products, these agricultural duties raised his prices about as much as could an import duty on fire wood raise the price of that product to the dweller in a primeval forest.

In spite of the tariff for agriculture, the condition of the farmer during the whole of the last quarter of the century was still an unprosperous one, the agrarian movement rolled on, propagandists and demagogues flourished, the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* reasoning was still the prevailing means of arriving at economic truths, and the two major parties alternately won and lost as succeeding waves of prosperity and depression flitted by in the course of the business cycle.

But over the past tariff legislation the protectionists felt a sense of duty well performed because the tariff revisions of 1883 were the outcome of the findings of a "tariff commission" (appointed in 1882) which was to study the question and recommend tariff "revisions" that would result in a "scientific tariff."¹⁰ Such a tariff should be satisfactory to all groups concerned, and, furthermore, would take the tariff issue out of politics. The story of this "tariff commission" is a happy one. It was voted by a protectionist congress, appointed by a protectionist president, and the chairman of the commission was Mr. John L. Hayes, secretary of the Wool Manufacturers' Association, a representative of an industry that enjoyed an unusual degree of protection through the tariff.

It developed that neither side was satisfied with the results of the "scientific tariff" of 1883. The farmer's condition had not been alleviated. He was no better off after twenty years of extreme protection than he was at the beginning. The feeling prevailed with him that something was still wrong, but he had no thoroughgoing convictions in the matter. The protectionists were still telling him that the remedy was to be still more of the remedy, while the opposition was telling him that protection had already gone too far. In the campaign of 1888 the issue was clearly a question of more or less protection. The

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 231.

protectionist sentiment won out, and the leaders mapped out a program which was to not only defend the existing system but to seek its further extension. And by the tariff acts of 1890, 1897, and 1909 duties were increased by one act or the other on woolen clothes and clothing, in some cases up to approximately 75 per cent, women's and children's dress goods, in some instances as high as 100 per cent, cotton prints, braids, and stockings up to 50 per cent to 70 per cent, while that on linen goods, laces, embroideries, silks, plushes, tin plate, and many miscellaneous manufactured products nearly doubled.

Yes, the agricultural producers were to share the benefits of the increased protection, and in the following way: They were to get an increase in the duty on high-grade raw wool, which would affect relatively only a few farmers; but because of this duty on raw wool the woolen manufacturers were to get in addition to a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem, a compensatory specific duty, to compensate for the increased price to them of raw wool, of 38½ cents per pound on imported woolens valued at only 35 cents or less per pound, which price included cost of wool, wages, and management. In addition to this duty on high-grade raw wool, the wool growers were to get an increase in the duty on very coarse, or carpet wools, none of which is grown in this country. Our farmers would have been equally benefited by a duty on kangaroo pelts. They were also granted higher duties on wheat and corn to shut the gate against commodities which had not been coming in.¹¹ A higher duty was granted on barley which did lend the

¹¹During this period, i.e. from about 1882-1911, our average annual importation of corn was 27,000 bushels per year, or about 1-740 of 1 per cent of our average annual production of approximately two billion bushels. At the same time, we were exporting hundreds of millions of bushels in the form of animal products. During this same period, our average annual importation of wheat was approximately ¼ of 1 per cent of our average annual production. Year for year, our exports of wheat amounted to from 50 to 100 times our wheat imports. (Data from U. S. Dept. of Agriculture *Year Book* [1923], pp. 662, 1114.)

grower some protection, but this was offset by a reduction of the duty on rice. Duties were increased also on hemp and flax, two commodities which farmers had practically quit growing, while the duty on jute, which some southern farmers were interested in producing, was dropped altogether. Higher duties were likewise granted on potatoes¹² and eggs, which might cause slight readjustments near the Canadian border, but as a means of granting relief to the great body of American agriculturists, they were inconsequential. It is true that the sugar producers have actually been getting the benefits of the sugar duty, but protection works here as it usually does, namely, that five-sixths of our total consumption is heavily taxed, in order to subsidize the growers of the one-sixth domestically produced.¹³ In general, there is strong evidence for the opinion that the farmers were sold to one thing, and got delivered something else.

CHANGES IN THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

If economic conditions and circumstances had continued as they were, with little or no amelioration for the distress of the farmer, the continuation of the American policy of protection would have been very doubtful. But soon after the passage of the Act of 1897, economic forces of national and world-wide significance again contributed to the making of an era of general prosperity for agriculture in the United States. A few of the more important of these forces were as follows: (1) The disappearance of the frontier checked the rate of the westward movement, and of the extension of the cultivated area of fertile lands. This resulted in the rise in land values, the decrease of the per capita production of most grains and live stock, as is

¹²Some Canadian potatoes come into our eastern markets pretty largely to supply them with the fresh product out of season with our production, or during years of shortage in this country. However, the quantity is of minor importance.

¹³Data for our 1923 production showed that of our total consumption, domestic cane constituted 4 per cent, and domestic beet constituted 13 per cent.

shown by the United States census data, all of which inure to the benefit of the producer who is already settled on super-marginal land. (2) This relative decrease in American production was accompanied by a growing European demand for agricultural products, due, in the main, to the growth of European industrial cities, and the working of the principle of diminishing returns in European agriculture. (3) The prices of many things the farmer had to buy were becoming cheaper, while improvements in agricultural technique and agricultural machinery lowered farm production costs, and the farmer was relatively better off. (4) And not least of all, gold production was on the increase, and prices were rising. To the extent that farmers were debtors, and the percentage of mortgaged farms to the number of all farms is always large, they are benefited by rising prices. Old mortgages are paid off more easily, and more land is bought to make of the 100-acre farm one of 160.

So, again, there was the coincidence of high tariffs and prosperity, and, again, there was the traditional association of cause and effect. The protectionist politicians and their system got the credit. For ten years or so, there was peace and good will generally on the tariff question. For this reason, the Act of 1897 was the longest-lived of any tariff act in American history.

But, along with rising prices, the cost of living was rising; the farmers were beginning to realize that if the tariff could raise prices, that it did not mean just farmers' prices. In fact, it seemed that prices of other things were advanced in greater proportion than the prices of farm products. What the farmer bought now was equally high with what he sold, and great profits were being made in large industries. It was not hard to persuade many that the cause of the high cost of living was all due to the tariff. By 1909, there was a considerable reaction against the higher rates, and a demand for a revision of the tariff downward. President Taft then recommended such a revision. About this time, the protectionists gave a new version of the "true" principle in tariff policy, by laying

down the doctrine that, "in all protective legislation, the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries." If the farmer should accept a strict interpretation of this doctrine, and take it for what it says, it would mean the virtual abandonment of foreign markets for our agricultural products. Such a course would make necessary the complete reorganization of our whole system of agricultural production.

A tariff to completely equalize the cost of production would mean, eventually, the cessation of imports. But, in the main, exports are paid for with imports; a stopping of one, over any period of time, must stop the other. The present depression of our farm prices is due, in no small degree, to our own excessive tariffs, which keep out foreign imports, the only practical means now of paying for our farm exports. When the American farmer sells his products abroad under existing tariff schedules, the government taxes the returning purchase on an average of 45 cents on each dollar's worth. But, the "true principle" as stated above was the argument put forth as the definite solution of the tariff question. The result was that the tariff Act of 1909 consisted of some minor reductions having little or no economic significance, and, in the main, making no concessions from the protectionist principle.

In the Congressional elections of 1910 and of 1912, the Republicans suffered defeat on this issue, and the Democrats were in complete control of the government. In the first place, the cost of living was to be lowered by reductions in the tariff, and duties were cut. But before there was time to see just what the results would be, the Great War broke out, and again economic forces were stronger than the tariff. The rise in the cost of living was sharper than ever, and at the same time the farmers' condition was more prosperous. The tariff, one way or the other, was a negligible matter. Even had the War not broken out at this time, the reductions in duties made by the Democrats

in 1913 could by no means have effected a corresponding reduction in the cost of living. Such expectations are based upon the assumption that every cut in duty brings a corresponding change in the price. The duty on sugar was reduced, and wool was made free. Such changes in the duty will reflect themselves in lower prices. But equal changes in the duty of certain prohibitive rates could have no effect whatever. This is largely true of the reduction on iron and steel products, and on the cheaper grades of cotton goods. To reduce the duty on goods made more cheaply in the United States than elsewhere would have no economic significance.

Out of this tariff legislation the farmer got some "balm" from the reduction of duties on fencing wire, agricultural implements, and machinery, such as plows, harrows, wagons, carts, headers, harvesters, cotton gins, and, in the words of the Act, "all agricultural implements of any kind or description, whehter specifically mentioned herein or not, including their parts."¹⁴ Many farmers really expected these reductions to bring materially lower prices on much of the farm equipment, but the country from which these things could be imported at lower costs seemed never to have received any consideration.

Independent of any tariff provisions, the War caused the prices of farm products to soar. Such a time is when farmer movements subside, and when free trade is just as good as protection, and *vice versa*. The tariff issue was dead, so far as agriculture was concerned.

THE FORDNEY-MCCUMBER TARIFF

A change of the post-war price level was inevitable. The war demand was gone, foreign production had revived, and hazards of transportation from distant producing centers eliminated. Agricultural prices fell as they had never fallen before, both relatively and absolutely. More than this, as compared with other products, they fell first, fell faster, and fell farthest. In terms of purchasing power, farmers were

¹⁴Taussig, F. W., *Tariff History of the United States*, p. 441.

worse off than any other group. The reasons for this is a long, complicated story in itself, and will not be discussed here. The farmer wanted relief, and he wanted it at once. He is impatient with a cure which the economists would recommend, as one too theoretical, and one which he does not always have the time and inclination to apply. He, therefore, wants quick results, a short-cut remedy of a painless sort. This makes him often the victim of panaceas, nostrums, and political propaganda of the rottenest sort. To him, plausibility is one of the chief prerequisites of any remedy, and the tariff seems to meet this requirement.

Soon after the War, there was a feeling prevalent that great stores of surplus agricultural products awaited transportation to American shores to beat down prices, coupled with the desire of some to preach the old doctrine of "tariff and prosperity," and the extreme national spirit which the War left, made it easy, indeed, to launch a vigorous campaign for a tariff to protect American agriculture. In fact, the demand for protection was easily foreseen by students of the economic situation. It is the sort of remedy the farmers like; it is quickly and simply applied, and comes "highly recommended" as one that will get results. The Farm Bloc in Congress simply required that farm duties be as high as the manufacturers' rates.¹⁵

The result of the agitation was the Emergency Tariff Act of May, 1921, followed the next year by the enactment of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law. In this Act, protective rates, if not real protection, were fully realized. No commodity or industry or group was neglected. It was a process of give and take, a sort of "you scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours" affair. Each group of producers practically dictated its own schedule of rates, and thus had no quarrel with any other group over the amount of the protection it received. Protection for agricultural producers ranged all the way from protection on acorns and eggs to reindeer meat.¹⁶ Whether the commodities were produced in excess

¹⁵Capper, Arthur, *"The Agricultural Bloc"*, chap. 10.

¹⁶U. S. Tariff Commission, *Bull. Comparison of the Tariff Acts*, Washington, Gov't Printing Office, pp. 704, 754.

or deficiency of domestic needs, the duties were put on indiscriminately. It is very evident that these agricultural duties will have no effect one way or the other on the farmers' welfare.

EXTENT OF FARMERS' BENEFITS FROM THE TARIFF

A protective tariff, in this country, has from the beginning, as it everywhere inevitably must, fallen with especially depressing effect upon those who must sell their surplus in an unprotected market. This has been the position of producers of agricultural products. In so far as the tariff has made it impossible for Europe to pay for our exports of agricultural products, to that extent it has promoted agricultural depression. Opinions from sound-thinking business men of the country, and of our economists, give little support to the contention that the tariff can greatly benefit agriculture. On this point, a recent statement by a New York banker is significant. "To the extent that they (nations in general) want the products of foreign countries, they must export their own to pay for them. . . ."

"Each producer's offering is his own purchasing power, and if he cannot sell, he cannot buy."¹⁷ If this statement be true, the tariff has greatly modified Europe's effective demand for our surplus food products. On this same point, B. M. Anderson of the Chase National Bank, New York City, says, "There has been a great change in opinion in banking circles throughout the country in recent years regarding the tariff. This has been manifest, not only in expressions by individual bankers and banking institutions, but even in statements by the Economic Policy Commission of the American Bankers' Association."¹⁸

From the agricultural west comes the statement from Melvin A. Traylor, president of the First Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago, that, "we cannot hope to produce everything ourselves, and do nothing but sell, and never buy. We are dependent upon foreign trade for the prosperity of

¹⁷Nat'l City Bank Bull. (April, 1924) p. 50.

¹⁸Chase Economic Bull., vol. III, No. 5 (Nov., 1923), p. 3.

nearly half our population—those who live on the farms; and if the peoples who buy the products of our soil are to be made prosperous, so they may be in a position to buy, then it will be necessary for them also to sell some of their products to us. We Americans can never hope to maintain our proper position in world trade unless we learn the lesson that international trade consists not merely of selling, but has also the element of buying as a necessary part.”¹⁹ Professor J. Lawrence Laughlin designates the Fordney-McCumber tariff as “the tariff of exaggerations,” and adds this further comment relative to the farmer: “The exaggerated tariff is, therefore, under fire. Our farmers and our working men have their ears to the ground to find out whether our exports (on which their livelihood and employment largely depend) are to be restricted by stupid or tricky ways of reducing imports. They know we cannot sell our exports to advantage, except by getting a goodly amount of imports in return.”²⁰

Concerning the politics of the tariff, Professor Laughlin remarks of the Fordney-McCumber tariff, that “if we are asked how this present tariff got into the statutes, the answer is that it was the result of politics.” We have other evidences of the politics of our tariffs in such provisions as the following: In 1913, when the question of agricultural rates was being discussed in the House, there was advocacy of duties on wheat and cattle (in order to placate the producer), and, at the same time, of putting flour and meat on the free list (to protect the consumer). The Fordney tariff provided for a wheat tariff of 30 cents per bushel, to protect the farmer, yet provides that any amount of wheat can be imported for milling purposes, provided it is again exported (which simultaneously lessens the milling demand for American wheat).²¹ The Act provides also for protection to stock growers, by a relatively high duty on fat cattle, and dressed beef, but allows any number of “feeders and

¹⁹*Farm and Fireside* (March, 1924), p. 3.

²⁰*North American Review* (Feb., 1923), p. 149.

²¹67th Cong., House Doc. No. 393, *Tariff Act of 1922*, p. 92.

stockers" to come in at a much lower rate, in order to be fattened and slaughtered here. Last winter, during the time when the price of wheat was relatively lower than it had been in this country for a quarter of a century, in spite of a tariff of 30 cents per bushel on wheat, it was decided by high officials in the Government that the tariff should be raised, under the flexible provisions of the Fordney tariff, to 42 cents. And it was so raised. But to conform to "true" protectionist principles, a commission had to be appointed first, to make an investigation into the difference in the cost of producing wheat in the United States and Canada. This commission went to work, and completed a year or more of work in a few weeks, and made its report to the President. Of course, it was a favorable report; it would have been a failure had it not been so.

Such cost of production studies are of special interest to the agricultural economist, and when carried on under government direction should contain a fund of valuable information. In view of this fact, a letter was sent to the Tariff Commission requesting a copy of the report of the investigating committee to obtain the latest methods on determining cost of production of agricultural products. To this request came the reply that, "The Commission's report on this subject was submitted to the President on March 4, 1924, and the President has since issued his proclamation based thereon. The Commission, however, has not felt at liberty to make public its report, and cannot do so unless and until the President shall indicate his willingness to have it done.

"Up to the present time, the Commission has no such indication from the White House." At other times, the published reports of the Tariff Commission have been sent freely upon application.

After seeing the workings of the present agricultural tariff in its various aspects, and being compelled to continue to accept low prices and pay high prices, the farmers are not so enthusiastic about the Fordney tariff. The American Farm Bureau Federation made a recent study of how the tariff affected the farmer, and, after balancing profit and

loss, came to the conclusion that the American farmers, as a whole, lose approximately \$375,000,000 annually because of the operation of the tariff.

Therefore, speaking for the American farmer, Mr. O. E. Bradfute, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said recently, in regard to the farmer and the tariff, "The farmers are more and more taking the stand that they do not reap any benefits from a protective tariff, and I think the industries should make note of the fact that unless the farmers have some plan by which they can receive equal benefits they will cease to longer support a protective tariff that works only to their disadvantage."²²

²²American Farm Bureau, *Weekly News Letter*, (Feb. 21, 1924).

NEWS AND NOTES

EDITED BY FRANK M. STEWART
University of Texas

Dr. W. M. W. Splawn, president of the Southwestern Political and Social Science Association, was elected President of the University of Texas, during the summer.

Mayor E. R. Cockrell of Fort Worth, ex-president of the Association, has resigned to become president of William Woods College at Fulton, Mo.

Mr. B. F. Wright, Jr., has been promoted from instructor to adjunct professor of Government at the University of Texas. Mr. Wright is on leave of absence for the year 1924-1925, finishing the work for his doctorate at Harvard University.

Mr. Charles A. Timm has been promoted from assistant to instructor in Government at the University of Texas.

Professor J. P. Comer has resigned his position in the Political Science Department at Southern Methodist University, to accept a position in Williams College.

Mr. H. H. Guice of Dallas has been appointed assistant professor of Political Science and Business Law at Southern Methodist University.

Dr. T. G. Gronert of the department of Political Science and History of the University of Arkansas has resigned, to go to Wabash College.

Mr. W. E. Gettys, adjunct professor of Sociology at the University of Texas, resigned during the summer, to go to McGill University.

Mr. E. F. Bamford of the department of Sociology of Baylor University is completing the work for his doctorate at the University of Southern California.

Professor C. M. Woodward, head of the department of Sociology at Southern Methodist University, resigned at the close of the spring term, to take a position at Emory University.

Mr. H. L. Pritchett, former head of the department of Education at Sam Houston State Teachers' College, has

been appointed head of the department of Sociology at Southern Methodist University.

Professor D. F. McCollum, head of the department of History at the East Texas State Teachers' College, is on leave of absence for the session 1924-1925. Professor McCollum is a part-time instructor in New York University, and is working toward his doctorate at Columbia University.

Dr. Malbone W. Graham, Jr., adjunct professor of Government, University of Texas, resigned during the summer, to accept a position as assistant professor of Political Science in the University of California, Southern Branch.

Mr. Joseph G. Maytin of Stanford University has been appointed instructor in Government at the University of Texas.

It has been announced by the Committee on Public Lectures that Dr. Charles A. Beard will deliver a series of addresses at the University of Texas in the winter of 1925.

The department of Government of the University of Texas was represented at the second meeting of the Conference on the Science of Politics, held at the University of Chicago, in September, by Messrs. B. F. Wright, Jr., J. G. Maytin, and F. M. Stewart.

Professors John Alley and Harry Barth of the department of Government of the University of Oklahoma attended the second annual Conference on the Science of Politics, held at the University of Chicago, in September.

The annual meeting of the Texas Conference of Social Welfare was held at Austin, October 26-29.

Mr. Irvin Stewart of the department of Government of the University of Texas contributed an article to the June issue of the *National Municipal Review*, on "Zoning and the Courts in Texas." He is on leave for the session of 1924-1925, completing the work toward his doctorate at Columbia University.

Dr. C. P. Patterson, associate professor of Government, University of Texas, is the author of a chapter, "The Schools of Jurisprudence," in a volume just published on *Recent Political Theories*.

Dr. O. Douglas Weeks of the University of Wisconsin has assumed his position as instructor in Government at the University of Texas. He is offering courses in comparative government, political theory, and political parties.

Recent publications of Dr. H. G. James, dealing with the government and politics of Brazil, are receiving favorable comment in the press of that country. The *Gazeta de Noticias*, an important daily paper of Rio de Janeiro, carried in its issue of October 9 a laudatory discussion of Dr. James' work in Brazil, and of his publications. The article concluded with a full translation in Portuguese of Dr. James' article in the September issue of *Current History*, "The Military Revolt of Sao Paulo." On the following day, the *Jornal do Commercio*, another great daily of Rio, quoted, with approval, the article that had appeared in the *Gazeta de Noticias*.

Mr. Luther H. Evans, former assistant in Government at the University of Texas, has been appointed lecturer in Citizenship at Stanford University, and is working toward his doctorate.

Mr. Francis G. Wilson, former assistant in Government at the University of Texas, has been appointed to a teaching fellowship in Political Science at the University of California, where he is working on his doctorate.

BOOK REVIEWS

McILWAIN, CHARLES HOWARD. *The American Revolution: A Constitutional Interpretation.* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. Pp. 198.) 1

For Professor McIlwaine, the American Revolution began only when the Colonists first repudiated the control of that organ of the British Government which constitutionally exercised authority over them. Was this organ Parliament and Crown, or only the King? Denial of the legislative authority of Parliament came in the First Continental Congress in 1774; repudiation of the authority of the King, only in May, or June, 1776. Which was, in the strict sense, revolutionary?

Later, American historians have commonly admitted that the legislative authority of Parliament over the Colonies, and over all "dominions," was legally complete; that the denial of this authority by radical Colonial leaders was constitutionally unjustified. Professor McIlwaine has his doubts on this point, and brings forth precedents in English constitutional history in justification not only of his doubts, but also of the position assumed by John Adams and other Revolutionary leaders. These precedents he finds in the controversies between the Irish and the English parliaments, in the relation of the Channel Islands with the realm of England, and in two cases involving the nature of the allegiance of the subject to the King. The central point of the problem is, of course, the relation of the "realm" and the "dominions," or, more exactly, what constitutional powers did Parliament have to legislate for the dominions? Were the dominions subject to the King only, or were they also subordinate to the British Parliament?

It is impossible here to indicate adequately the evidence which the learned author adduces. In brief, it is to the effect, first, that the Irish Parliament in 1641 asserted its independence of the English Parliament, that Irish writers in later years held to the same view, and that although the English Parliament generally insisted upon its own binding authority, it later, 1780, yielded the point. Again, the Channel Islands, originally a part of Normandy, have always claimed that no legislation of Parliament, or Order in Council, is binding force within the islands until registered by the local Royal Court. If the claim of all these dominions to legislative independence was valid, great weight was given to the claim of the Americans who were likewise citizens of dominions, and who made considerable use of the Irish arguments. It is on the Irish parallel that McIlwaine lays most stress, and the evidence is laid out in considerable detail. But the question remains whether the allegiance of the subject—in this case,

the colonist—was to the King in his natural person, or to the Crown, that is, to the executive head of the nation. Allegiance to the national Crown would imply subordination to national authority, and, hence, to the laws of Parliament. But Calvin's case is cited as evidence that the allegiance was feudal, and due only to the King personally. The inference is that it did not involve subordination of the subject in the "dominions" to the laws of the "realm." Professor McIlwaine, therefore, concludes that the precedents favor the contention that Parliament was without constitutional authority to legislate for the colonies.

With all deference to the universally acknowledged learning and ability of the author, it seems unlikely that scholars generally will accept fully his conclusions. Leaving aside altogether the assertion of supremacy over all dominions and territories by the Long Parliament in the "Commonwealth Act" of May 19, 1649, it is unquestionable that the Revolution of 1689 established the supremacy of Parliament in England, and brought about the substitution of parliamentary authority for the royal prerogatives. It must, therefore, have affected the relation of the dominions to this same Parliament. The change in the form of the coronation oath of William and Mary reveals precisely this thing. Professor McIlwaine assumes that the change in the coronation oath was either unknown or unaccepted in America, or that the extension of the authority of Parliament over colonial affairs, because not *formally* accepted, was rejected in the colonies. On the other hand, however, in the last pages of the book, 181-183, he seems to admit that the authority of Parliament *was* extended to America. As to Calvin's case, it came so early, 1608, that it can hardly be said to be applicable in 1774, while that of *Crow v. Ramsay*, 1670, seems really to be against the colonial position. But it is in minimizing the constitutional effect of the Revolution of 1689 that Professor McIlwaine is most unconvincing.

The last chapter is an examination of the colonial reliance upon charter rights, of natural law, and of natural law "engrafted into the British constitution." They are all trenchantly analyzed and rejected, and the author reiterates that the true ground of the colonists was on the nature of the constitution of the British Empire, the distinction between realm and dominions. He shows some irritation at the statement of Sydney George Fisher that it was "absurd" to suppose there was any part of the empire to which the whole power of Parliament did not extend; and he takes Schlesinger to task for saying that the colonial leaders "retreated" from one untenable legal position to another. McIlwaine thinks they "advanced" from an untenable position on the charters, first, to "natural law engrafted into the English constitution," and, finally, to the much stronger ground of immunity of the dominions from parliamentary control.

It is impossible in a brief review, to note with sufficient appreciation

the terse and incisive diction, the scores of pregnant suggestions, and the admirably objective attitude with which the evidence adduced is examined in this most interesting book. In these things, it is a model of its kind. Though short, it is crammed with statements to which the reader is tempted to return; it is unfortunate, therefore, that it has no index.

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL.

University of Texas.

MERRIAM, CHARLES E., AND GOSNELL, HAROLD F. *Non-Voting*. (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1924. Pp. xvi, 287.)

Non-Voting is the first scientific study of one of the most important problems of American democracy. This study was made under the auspices of the Local Community Research Committee of the University of Chicago, and was directed by Professor Merriam and Mr. Gosnell of the department of Political Science, who were assisted by a corps of field workers.

It is an attempt to explain why about 50 per cent of the electorate of the City of Chicago did not vote in the Mayor's election of 1923, in the hope that this cross-section analysis may throw some light on the national evil of non-voting. Out of a total of 740,000 non-voters, one-quarter of the population of the city, 6,000 were examined. A list of twenty reasons, under five categories of *physical difficulties, legal and administrative obstacles, disbelief in voting, and inertia*, is given as the causes for non-voting. It was discovered that the causes for more than 50 per cent of the women citizens interviewed not registering, were *indifference, ignorance regarding election, and disbelief in woman's voting*; the same percentage of men citizens interviewed explained their failure to register by *absence from the city, insufficient legal residence, and general indifference*. General indifference and ignorance of elections accounted for half of the cases of habitual non-voting among the Polish and Italian women. A more serious cause of non-voting was disgust with politics—a feeling of lack of confidence in the electoral process, which is manipulated by the professional politician, who is invariably a crook.

Some suggestions for the remedying of non-voting in Chicago include more adequate facilities to prevent congestion at the ballot box, extension of voting hours to 6 o'clock, information on absentee voting, greater familiarity with the process of voting, short ballot, publicity pamphlets, registration of voters by government agents rather than leaving the initiative to the voter, more adequate provision for transferring registration, and, finally, compulsory voting. While these mechanical devices are mentioned, it is pointed out that the non-voter must be convinced that his interest is inseparable from the character of the government, which is determined by "the capacity, honesty, vision, and constructive ability of its agents and repre-

sentatives." It is undoubtedly true that before non-voting can be materially diminished, its causes must be discovered and some generalization made. It is to be hoped, therefore, that this study may be the beginning of a series of such examinations which may furnish the technique for inducing the American voter to do his duty.

CALEB PERRY PATTERSON.

University of Texas.

GRAHAM, MALBONE W. JR. *The New Governments of Central Europe.* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1924. Pp. x, 383.)

This book treats of the new governments growing out of the dismemberment of the German and Austro-Hungarian empires, and, therefore, embraces the present governments of Germany, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. It derives its authoritative character from the sources upon which it is based. The author has had access to that veritable mine of information pertaining to recent and contemporary European politics and diplomacy—the Hoover War Library at Stanford University. The work furnishes abundant evidence of careful, penetrating, and extended research on the part of the author. He has broken new soil. The author's neglect of usual and hackneyed sources of information, and his disregard for the prevailing methods of treating governments is refreshing to the reader.

The author has assumed that the disintegration of the Hohenzollern and Hapsburg empires, and the birth of the Succession States are threads of the same story. Consequently, he has given something of a running account of the political upheavals, and of the new institutions which have appeared from the ruins of the imperial governments. While the interests, activities, and fortunes of the two empires were parallel, and even identical, during the years 1914-18, the development of the countries historically has produced different and opposite tendencies. Germany, although a federal state, was, from 1871, the world's greatest example of centralization of authority and power. On the contrary, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, with its conflicting and competing linguistic and racial elements, exhibited tendencies of disunion and disintegration to a marked degree. These tendencies would not be important in themselves but for the fact that these groups extended their aims to the possession and retention of political power. The outstanding example of distinction between the two empires is the war of 1866, resulting in Austria's withdrawal from the German confederation.

To be sure, the author has not denied these principles. His method of approach has only obscured them. By treating of the empires in separate and distinct parts of the book, and by grouping chapters dealing with a particular government under a single head, the author's organization and presentation of material would have been simpler and more intelligible. The tendencies of the empires which have

persisted in the Succession States appear in different parts of the book. But they do not stand out. One has to search for them.

Of the collapses of monarchy, the making of new constitutions, and the setting up of new governments, the writer has given a searching and faithful account. Moreover, the forces, and political structure of the governments, the working forces, and political measures, both constitutional and statutory, for economic and social betterment, receive their full share of attention. On these subjects, the author leaves little or nothing to the imagination of the reader.

As is always the case, it is in the interpretation of facts that an author most frequently misses the mark. Dr. Graham offends here no more than the ordinary careful author, and much less than many. In the opinion of the reviewer, the difficulties as regards interpretation spring from two sources: a mistaken or misleading statement of tendencies, and an over or under-emphasis of their importance. As an illustration of the first difficulty, one may cite the statement on page 31, which declares that the German Commonwealth may be called with fair accuracy a unitary state. While it is too early to predict with any finality whether the federal or unitary features of the German Commonwealth will prevail, the author clearly ignores certain features which give to the government a distinctive federal character. The constitution requires that states must exist. A republican form of government, with representative assemblies and a responsible cabinet, is stipulated. The powers of the states are residual. Limitations on state power are little more extensive than under the American Constitution, and the extraordinary powers conferred upon the central government are designed to meet exigencies which require a "state of siege."

An illustration of the second difficulty is found in the tendency of the writer to over-emphasize parliamentary features at the expense of certain characteristics which are presidential. While the parliamentary character of the governments is important, certain features of presidential government have found a definite place in the new constitutions (especially the German and Slovakian) which cannot well be overlooked.

With a studied effort to get away from monarchical institutions, the new governments had to appropriate ideas of government from the liberal states of western Europe, and from the United States. An analysis of the contributions of these governments does not appear.

The world of scholarship is enriched by a number of select documents appended to the book. These documents represent painstaking selection and translation. Every one is of interest and value to the student of comparative government. There is a complete index. Six large charts, giving graphic representations of cabinets and parties, are included.

The author's style is clear and direct. Every sentence is an effort

to get at the heart of the subject. The book is a real contribution to scholarship in the field of political science, and is the only authoritative account of the rise and growth of the Succession States not based in the main on constitutional documents alone. The chief merit of the book lies in the fact that the author looks into the social and economic conditions which bring the document forth. Dr. Graham has given the skeletons of the new political organism, together with the life which the framework is designed to support.

CHARLES E. MARTIN.

University of California, Southern Branch.

BLACHLY, FREDERICK F., AND OATMAN, MIRIAM E. *The Government of Oklahoma*. (Oklahoma City: Harlow Publishing Co., 1924. Pp. viii, 678.)

This comprehensive book on the government of Oklahoma is the joint work of Professor Blachly of the University of Oklahoma, and Miriam E. Oatman, assistant secretary of the Oklahoma Municipal League. Three other persons coöperated with the authors in the preparation of nine chapters of the book—Mr. John H. Bass, and Mr. Maurice H. Merrill, formerly instructors in government in the University of Oklahoma, and Miss Gladys Dickason, formerly assistant secretary of the Oklahoma Municipal League.

The treatment throughout is descriptive and analytical. The attempt has been made to describe the government at work, not merely as organized in the constitution and statutes. Court decisions and administrative practices are included wherever they have modified organization. The authors have described the existing government, pointed out its defects, and made recommendations for its improvement.

From their study of governmental system, the authors found certain fundamental faults in the state government. These are classified as "excessive constitutionalism; popular election of many state officers; an incorrect relationship of the executive to the legislature; wrong administrative organization in the state government; decentralization in local government without any adequate administrative supervision; no well coördinated administrative supervision of municipal government; of civil service methods; a decentralized judicial system."

To correct these faults and to provide a well organized and efficient government, several specific recommendations are made. A shorter and simpler constitution is needed, containing no statutory matter, and few limitations upon the power of the Legislature. The Constitution should provide for only the general outline of the government; detailed organization should be left to the legislative and executive departments. The short ballot principle should be applied to secure the popular election of the Governor alone. Closer coöperation should be established between the Legislature (a

unicameral body), and the Executive, by the adoption of some plan to make the Executive selected, and removable by the Legislature, and responsible to it. State administration should be reorganized under the Chief Executive, into a dozen or more departments under heads appointed and removed by the Governor. Subordinate employees should be selected according to the principles of the merit system. A staff of highly trained technical advisers should assist the Governor in collecting information and working out details of policy. County government should be reconstructed by giving to the State such functions as are statewide in scope,—as assessment of Taxes, law enforcement, etc. The remaining functions of the county should be divided into six departments,—finance, public welfare, public works, public records, agriculture, and education. Heads of these county departments should be appointed by a county manager, who should be selected by a Board of County Commissioners, elected from the county as a whole. Central control of county government should be exercised by the Local Government Department, and it “should include the requiring of reports, and the making of investigations, together with supervision, advice, and direct aid from the Central State Department in case of necessity.”

The relationship of the city to the state should be changed so as to give the city all powers except those expressly taken away from it, and to provide strict administrative control, through the Local Government Department, particularly over all matters in which the state has a definite interest.

Judicial reform should include the reorganization of all state courts into a general Court of Judicature,—which should have powers of adjudication and administrative power of supervision and direction of the court system, and the rule making function, which should be given to the court exclusively.

The book is a valuable contribution to the literature of state administration. It is to be hoped that it will be paralleled by similar studies in other states.

FRANK M. STEWART.

University of Texas.

MORRIS, C. R. AND MARY. *A History of Political Ideas*. (New York: Putnam's, 1914. Pp. 190.)

In a brief space, the authors of this new history of political ideas have gone to the heart of the political writings of some of the chief thinkers since Plato. Much that is essential to a comprehensive history of political thought has been left out, but the book makes no attempt to be comprehensive, or detailed. It rather attempts to give a clear interpretation of certain ages and types of thought, and in this it is, indeed, successful.

O. DOUGLAS WEEKS.

University of Texas.

HOLCOMBE, ARTHUR N. *The Political Parties of Today*. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1924. Pp. 339.)

To many voters, our great parties have become what Professor Holcombe calls "empty bottles." They apparently avoid the real issues of the day, and stand for nothing in particular. If this is true, what is the justification for their continued existence? And what of their future? These are the questions that are discussed. The constitutional, economic, and sectional bases of our party system are analyzed with special attention to recent party history. Minor parties are seen to be useful. The bi-partisan system is examined with an eye to the future, and a possible realignment is suggested.

O. DOUGLAS WEEKS.

University of Texas.

BROWN, PHILIP ANTHONY. *The French Revolution in English History*. (New York: Dutton, 1924. Pp. 232.)

This posthumously published work of Philip Anthony Brown, New College, Oxford, with its introduction by Professor Gilbert Murray, is a valuable contribution to the period of the French Revolution. It is, indeed, the first general account of the influence of the revolution in English political thought and activity. It treats in detail of the movement for parliamentary reform in England, which began in the seventeen-eighties, and which was accelerated and then retarded by the events in France. Special attention is given to the part played by Burke, and to the organization and suppression of the English Reform Societies. The general period of reaction in England, down to 1831, is surveyed, and an estimate given of the Revolution's permanent effects in that country. The book is enlivened by a full treatment of personalities and interesting incidents.

O. DOUGLAS WEEKS.

University of Texas.

MAXEY, CHESTER C. *An Outline of Municipal Government*. (Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1924. Pp. 388.) *Readings in Municipal Government*. (Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1924. Pp. 627.)

The time-honored apology of every author launching another volume upon the unresisting world, especially in the textbook field, viz., that no book suitable for the purpose the author had in mind existed, has not been omitted by Professor Maxey in the preface to his *Outline of Municipal Government*.

At first, such a justification sounds a bit presumptuous, especially in a field like that of Municipal Government, where such a number of recent texts by outstanding authorities are available. Teaching is so much a matter of individual interest and emphasis, of the amount of time available, of the secondary aids at hand, and even of the

character of the students, that no teacher will find the textbook prepared by another exactly suited to his individual needs, no matter how valuable intrinsically that textbook may be. Only the teacher who is but superficially informed on, or interested in, his subject will be quite content with the presentation of the subject by another.

By the same sign, however, the writer launching another such text cannot hope to find other instructors whose ideals are exactly realized by his new volume. He is fortunate if he succeeds in finding any appreciable number whose conceptions are enough like his own so that the new work comes nearer to meeting their needs than the already existing texts. The proof of such a pudding is obviously in the eating.

Professor Maxey has presented his material in the briefest possible form, and himself calls attention to the appropriateness of the designation of the work as an outline. For that very reason, it will appeal to many readers who have not the patience to wade through more pretentious works, and it will be especially suited to courses devoting but little time to the study of municipal government. The more such books we have, the more are all needs likely to be met, and consequently the more encouragement there is for the offering of college courses in this important field. This, in itself, is a worth-while result.

As regards the volume on *Readings*, the personal element of preference is even more strongly pronounced than in the case of the textual presentation. No two individuals could possibly agree as to what material should be selected for inclusion within a certain space, determined by hard-headed and hard-hearted publishers. But Professor Maxey has, without question, gathered together a great deal of interesting material which students can read with profit, and much of which could not easily be made available in other form.

H. G. J.

University of Texas.

MERRIAM, CHARLES EDWARD, AND OTHERS. *A History of Political Theories, Recent Times*. (New York: MacMillan, 1924. Pp. 597.)

This work, which treats of recent and contemporary political theories, is designed to supplement, chronologically, the three volumes of the late Professor Dunning's *Political Theories*. It is published as a memorial volume to Professor Dunning, and is the joint-contribution of thirteen of his former students, who have attained prominence, each one contributing a chapter. The subject matter is treated topically, which is necessary because of the brief period it covers, and the many theorists it considers. Furthermore, it extends beyond the scope of what might be strictly termed "political theory," for, in addition to chapters on democracy, pluralistic doc-

trines, and proletarian thought, the contributions of sciences kindred to political science are considered.

The chapters on the political theories developed by International Law and Jurisprudence are contributed, respectively, by E. M. Borchard, Yale University Law School, and Caleb Perry Patterson, University of Texas. Another chapter on "Political Implications of Recent Philosophical Movements" is the work of Herbert W. Schneider, Columbia University, and Harry Elmer Barnes, Smith College, has presented "Some Contributions of Sociology to Modern Political Theory." The chapters dealing with the political ideas derived from social psychology, anthropology, and anthropogeography are particularly striking. The influence of these sciences has hitherto been neglected, and their introduction gives the field of political theory a broader and more scientific basis. Gehlke, Goldweiser, Franklin Thomas, and Hankins have contributed these latter chapters. Charles E. Merriam, F. W. Coker, Paul H. Douglas, Carlton J. H. Hayes, and Malcolm M. Willey have presented the more purely political aspects.

The book is, in every way, commendable. Its scholarship is undoubted, and it is a most useful and comprehensive compilation of recent political ideas. It has the value of placing within one volume a mass of hitherto scattered material, and of giving it shape and interpretation. It also puts a much needed emphasis on the contributions of allied sciences to the usually restricted field of political theory. It is, however, in no sense a continuation of Professor Dunning's work, for it is said that Professor Dunning himself regarded recent political speculations as "radically unintelligible." It is certainly true today that "most of the old problems, the well-defined distinctions, and the apparently cumulative wisdom of past generations seem discarded, and one is plunged into a sea of new problems, new states, new sovereignties, new nationalisms, new men, and new gods, without chart, compass, or anchor, and with naught but new waves for a horizon." Nevertheless, the volume under discussion truly supplements the ordered work of Professor Dunning, and does something toward dispelling the chaos of contemporary political ideas, by presenting in orderly fashion, under one cover, a useful summary of the new doctrines and tendencies.

O. DOUGLAS WEEKS.

University of Texas.

ARTHUR, GUY ENOCH. *The Problem of Armaments. A Book for Every Citizen of Every Country.* (New York, 1923.)

This book sounds strange to post-war ears. The author, an engineer, proves, by statistics, the accuracy of the statement, of which there is no reason to doubt, that war is an appallingly expensive folly. Those familiar with anti-war arguments long before the outbreak of the last war will find in this book little of interest.

Quotations from leading English statesmen, before and after the war, all of which hammer on the point of the absurdity and criminality of war expenditures, are not very convincing when these same statesmen, with a sigh of regret, true or false, go on piling up armaments. And that armaments are the most immediate cause of war, the author makes clear enough. It is also quite clear and undisputable, as he puts it "that the labor of 30,000 persons for over one hundred years would be needed for shells only produced under the British Ministry of Munitions, and projected thru the air," and again, that "an approximate computation, arrived at by a number of processes, and then averaged, of wasted human effort during the Great War, is the employment of about one million workers working forty-four hours per week for 3,000 years," but all of this only reminds one of the meeting at which David Starr Jordan was explaining to a group of University students that it would cost \$50,000 to kill one German, and then asked them, that at that rate, how many Germans they would want to kill, and with one voice, they shouted: All of them! Arguments of cost do not weigh with human beings, particularly when the cost mounts up into perfectly intelligible tens and hundreds of billions. It is rather amusing that the author regrets the death of Ambassador Page, (regrettable as that might be on many other grounds), because "had he lived longer the world might have seen an illuminative beam of light which (might point) the way out of the tangle (of armaments)," when the voices of Norman Angel and Brailsford and Dickinson and Morel and hosts of others have been crying in the wilderness for over twenty years. It seems that the author, with the best intentions in the world, is only just now waking up to the whole stupidity of war, and realizing its utter senselessness and suicidal character. But his earnestness is so evident, and his efforts so sincere, that, although he has nothing to offer but one more scheme for the outlawing and licensing of the manufacture of armaments, one is grateful for even a partial return to sanity in high places. But the way out of the tangle is not his way, and who knows whether there is a way out.

MAX SYLVIVS HANDMAN.

University of Texas.

ROSS, EDWARD ALSWORTH. *The Social Revolution in Mexico.* (New York: Century, 1923.)

PRIESTLY, HERBERT INGRAM. *The Mexican Nation, a History.* (New York, 1923.)

There is no doubt that Professor Ross in writing about Mexico does it with sympathy and with the understanding which comes from trained observation of social clinical cases. Yet the result, the impression left on the reader, is that the information one gathers about Mexico from this little book is far from convincing, and that

the picture is blurred, although sufficiently colorful. He speaks contemptuously of the "new-fangled intelligence-tests," yet he accepts their findings, with something of regret, to be sure, but he accepts them. He guards himself against misinterpretation by the imperialists who might "tag any weaker people 'inferior' as an excuse for bringing it under subjection" by stoutly affirming that "nothing set down here is intended to give these men any comfort," but the comfort, and plenty of it, has already been given only a page or two back, by saying such things as these: "I should be surprised if intelligence tests did not reveal among them (the Mexicans) a larger proportion of subnormals than the Chinese, and a smaller contingent of supers This conclusion, that the folk mass below the Rio Grande is not rich in talents If the red Indian is not the intellectual peer of the yellow race, or the white race then no amount of education and no release of stimulating ozone into the social atmosphere will avail to close the gap between Mexico and the onward countries." The conclusion is fatal although amiable. The Mexican is kindly, sensitive to beauty and other gentle but contemptible things in a world where intelligence and energy count for more than anything else. The other more tough-minded conclusions which Professor Ross does not wish to draw from these premises of racial inferiority will be drawn, and are drawn daily by the foreign speculator, prospector, and Mexican exploiter, who argue, just like Professor Ross (if Professor Ross will pardon my mentioning his name in the same breath with them), that you can expect nothing from an inferior people, and that you cannot afford to let the march of civilization be blocked by the mere historical accident that an inferior, incapable race happens to be living at the end of the rainbow.

Everything else in the book about Mexican politics, land reform, the labor movement, the church is said with deep understanding of human values, with a paternal kindness toward a sick child. What interest Professor Ross is the lot of the masses, and he feels for them and pleads for them like only he can plead with his intellectual alertness and gifted pen. I must, however, take exception to his charter on education, because it does Vasconcelos a great injustice. To dismiss him by calling him "a lawyer with literary taste," and to speak of his work simply that "the activities of his department exhibit certain bents of the Latin mind," is to completely misunderstand the great educational revolution which the activity of Vasconcelos is responsible for. His idea was to carry education to precisely the people who need it, the Indians and the peons, and he has done more for them than all the previous efforts combined. Professor Ross' contemptuous reference to the books published by the Secretariat of Education is again based upon misunderstanding. Vasconcelos is psychologically correct in sending out the world's classics into the remote corners of the land. He is sending books where books were

never seen before, and in such places the function of the book is not only to be read, but to be a symbol of the world beyond, to which the book is a key. Disinterested and even hostile observers have agreed that Vasconcelos's libraries in the City of Mexico are always crowded with readers.

Professor Priestly's book on Mexico is the best thing yet done on the subject. There has been great need of a compact but full and reliable account of Mexico. The only book worth mentioning was Nicolas Leon's *Compendio de la Historia General de Mexico*. But Leon is primarily an ethnologist and an antiquarian, and his book shows the bias of his specialties. Professor Priestly's book is written from the standpoint of the modern historian, and he makes clear the inheritance of culture which the Mexican possesses. Professor Priestly's previous work ranked high, even among the Mexicans, and whatever criticism of his latest work might be made by any of the Social Scientists, from the standpoint of the historian the product of his labor can be read with interest, profit and pleasure.

MAX SYLVIVS HANDMAN.

University of Texas.

PARMELEE, MAURIEE, PH.D. *Blockade and Sea Power*. (Thomas Y. Crowell Co. Pp. 448.)

In this work the author gives a description and makes an analysis of the operation of the Allied Blockade during the Great War. Particular attention is directed by him to the numerous commissions and boards in the different Allied countries which were responsible for the carrying out of the Blockade. It is to the work of these commissions, and to the highly centralized organization under which they functioned, that he attributes the success of the Blockade. A great deal of statistical data is used by him to show the effects of the Blockade upon the economic conditions and the health of the civil population of Germany and her allies. These effects, he maintains, were especially responsible for the surrender of the Central Powers.

The work is full of denunciations of both the Allies and the Central Powers for the gross violations of the rules and customs of International Law committed in pursuing the war. The author's accusations are particularly directed against Germany. He takes upon himself the duty of defending the rights of the neutral powers who were the greatest sufferers in the war.

In discussing the Sea Power and its utilization during the war, he comes to the conclusion that it is, alongside with land armaments, the greatest source and cause of all the wars in the past, as well as of the recent war. He thinks that no nation should be allowed to possess a powerful fleet. He is strongly committed to the freedom of the seas, and says that "excessive naval power is incompatible with it. However pacific may be the purpose of the nation possessing such

power, the very existence of a powerful navy is certain in the course of time to lead to violations of the freedom of the sea."

The author is rather idealistic in many respects, and at times lets his idealism get the best of his "practicalism." This is especially true in his advocacy of a World State which he believes is the only solution for the prevention of wars in the future. He particularly assails the doctrine of "national sovereignty" that dominates the Powers today, and deplores the fact that the League of Nations is not devoid of that element. This part of the book is, perhaps, the most interesting and instructive. The author is far from being utopian, and his idealism is a sort of a "practical internationalism." He bases his advocacy of a World State and the possibility of its realization upon facts of Allied coöperation during the war—the coöperation which manifested itself in the allocation of tonnage, distribution of raw materials, and other supplies, as well as in the coöperation in the direction of military and other policies. If that was possible during the war, why cannot such an organization of affairs be continued? He advocates an International Parliament which would outline world policies, an International Economic Council for the purpose of controlling and distributing the world supply of raw materials, and an International Police Force, both on land and sea, for the purpose of controlling and enforcing the rules of International Law. In short, he wants to see an International World Organization from which the idea of national sovereignty would be wholly absent.

In this latter respect, the author manifests a great deal of *naïveté*. Has he forgotten the difficulties that accompanied the birth of the League of Nations, and the opposition it encountered from the statesmen of the Great Powers? Besides, the fact that the European Powers gave up a part of their independence and sovereignty during the war, does not necessarily mean that they would be willing to continue to do so in time of peace. The contrary should have been expected, and this is exactly what happened, as the aftermath of the Peace Conference very well indicates. Here is where the author ignored the working of human nature and deplored in vain the failure of the Great Powers to form a World State through the League of Nations.

However, the book is instructive in many ways. It is a valuable source of information for the student of Diplomacy and Economics. It has valuable statistical data which can be used for many purposes. Aside from that, it also has the merit of being written in a very good, simple style, and is very comprehensive and readable.

JOSEPH GREGORY MAYTIN.

University of Texas.

WILLIAMS, EDWARD THOMAS. *China Yesterday and Today*. (New York, 1923.)

The task accomplished by the author of this book is worthy of

admiration. In 600 pages he has managed to give an amazing array of facts, figures, and impressions. Having lived in China for thirty-five years, both in official and unofficial capacities, he has had occasion to observe and leisure to study. The book is well written, and conveniently divided into chapters and sections. The period covered begins with pre-history and ends with the trade act of 1922. The topics covered include Pumpelly's excavation; the Chinese family; the Guilds (a very enlightening chapter, unfortunately too brief); the farmer and the republican character of the social organization of China; religion (all the religious sects are treated); amusements; the history of foreign intercourse; the most recent struggle around "spheres of influence"; the political revolution, and the most recent details of foreign trade. Specific information is available on such matters as Chinese weights and measures, money and currency, and, in the appendix, there are given the most recent statistics bearing on all the statistically available facts about China and Chinese life. The book is well written and illustrated, making it the most valuable short Compendium of Modern China.

MAX SYLVIVS HANDMAN.

University of Texas.

The present social and economic conditions in Czecho-Slovakia are surveyed by Dr. Josef Gruber (Editor), Charles University, Prague, in a volume entitled *Czecho-Slovakia* (MacMillan, 1924. Pp. 256). This volume consists of a collection of discussions by high government officials, college professors, and financiers of that country, on various social and economic topics, each one treated in a separate chapter by an authority in that particular field. Some of the subjects treated are, population, agriculture, forestry, land reform, coal, industries, railways, labor legislation, and crime. Each discussion is clearly and concisely written, and is well illustrated and buttressed with statistics, both in the context and in separate tables. A few outline maps would have been welcomed, particularly by the American reader. A careful reading of this volume impresses one with the great difficulty new Europe is encountering in trying to reconcile national with economic boundary lines. This difficulty is especially apparent in the states that developed on the ruins of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, more particularly in the case of Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia. The former is mainly agricultural, whereas nearly all the manufacturing industries of the old empire are now found in the latter. This situation was economically satisfactory before 1918, but now, with high tariff walls and strong national feelings on all sides, the farmers of Hungary and the industrialists of Czecho-Slovakia are learning that all national problems are not solved by the mere satisfaction of desires for national independence. Yet, as this volume clearly shows, Czecho-Slovakia is

making great strides in the direction of stabilizing her whole social and economic life.

English Colonies in Guiana and on the Amazon, by James A. Williamson (Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1923. Pp. 191) give a well-written account of the almost forgotten English efforts to plant colonies on the Guiana coast and on the Amazon during the seventeenth century. In the preparation of this volume, the author made use of every possible source of information. Many of the original records are now lost or in an almost illegible condition, a fact which the author of the present work frankly acknowledged by the use of such terms as "may," "perhaps," and "probably." He sees these colonies as "a microcosm of the great movement of colonial history in the seventeenth century—the push of the three great colonizing powers, England, France, Holland, to crowd out and supplant the two original ones, Spain and Portugal" (p. 61). This volume is a worthy contribution to that great mass of historical literature which seeks to present an adequate and correct view of those great colonizing ventures of Englishmen in the seventeenth century, ventures which, whether fully realized or not, changed the course of history, not only for English-speaking people, but also for a great part of the remainder of the world.

PROCEEDINGS
of the
FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
of the
SOUTHWESTERN POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
ASSOCIATION
March 24-26, 1924
Fort Worth, Texas

CONTENTS

Foreword

The Relationship Between the State Legislature, the Utilities Commission, and the Courts in Rate Making	F. F. Blachly
The Limitation of Judicial Review	Herman B. Chubb
The Relationship Between the Executive and the Legislature in the British Self-Governing Colonies	S. W. Swenson
The Effects of Separation of Legislative and Executive Powers in State Government	Miriam E. Oatman
The Arkansas Secession Convention of 1861	Thomas S. Staples
The Corporation in the State Constitutional Conventions of 1835-1860	Theodore G. Gronert
The Cherokee Strip Live Stock Association	Edward Everett Dale
The De la Huerta Revolution in Mexico	Charles W. Hackett
Eastern Europe and the League of Nations	John C. Granberry
Some Legal and Historical Antecedents of the Mandatory System	Luther H. Evans
The Record Made in Hearings on Consolidation of Western Railroads	Walter Splawn
The Development of Real Estate Courses in Universities and Colleges	A. W. Jamison
The League of Nations as a Humanitarian Agency	O. E. Baker
Agricultural Rent in Relation to Land Value in Theory and in Practice	F. A. Buechel
A Study of the Texas Farm Bureau Cotton Association	R. H. Montgomery
Some Aspects of Recent Population Changes in Missouri	Walter B. Bodenhafer
Industrialization and the Mexican Casual	E. F. Bamford
Effects of Industrialization Upon the Negro	W. J. McConnell

270 PAGES

Paper Bound - - - - - \$1.00
Cloth Bound - - - - - \$2.00

**Order from F. M. Stewart, Secretary-Treasurer, University of Texas,
Austin, Texas**